THE ANCIENT NOVEL AND BEYOND

Stelios Panayotakis
Maaike Zimmerman
Wytse Keulen,
Editors

BRILL

THE ANCIENT NOVEL AND BEYOND

MNEMOSYNE

BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA BATAVA

COLLEGERUNT

H. PINKSTER • H.S. VERSNEL

D.M. SCHENKEVELD • P.H. SCHRIJVERS

S.R. SLINGS

BIBLIOTHECAE FASCICULOS EDENDOS CURAVIT

H. PINKSTER, KLASSIEK SEMINARIUM, OUDE TURFMARKT 129, AMSTERDAM

SUPPLEMENTUM DUCENTESIMUM QUADRAGESIMUM PRIMUM

STELIOS PANAYOTAKIS, MAAIKE ZIMMERMAN, WYTSE KEULEN

THE ANCIENT NOVEL AND BEYOND

TUTA SUB AEGIDE PALLAS · 1683 ·

THE ANCIENT NOVEL AND BEYOND

EDITED BY

STELIOS PANAYOTAKIS, MAAIKE ZIMMERMAN,
WYTSE KEULEN

BRILL
LEIDEN · BOSTON
2003

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

The Ancient Novel and Beyond / edited by Stelios Panayotakis, Maaike Zimmerman, Wytse Keulen.
p. cm. – (Mnemosyne, bibliotheca classica Batava. Supplementum; v. 241)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 9004129995
1.Classical Fiction-History and criticism. 2.Literature, Medieval-Classical influences 3. Literature, Modern-Classical Influences.

PA3040.A46 2003
809.3–dc21

2003045392

ISSN 0169-8958
ISBN 90 04 129995

© Copyright 2003 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910 Danvers, MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

This collection is dedicated to

BRYAN REARDON

This page intentionally left blank

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface and Acknowledgements
MAAIKE ZIMMERMAN xi

PART ONE: *THE ANCIENT NOVEL IN CONTEXT*

Alexander the Great in the Arabic Tradition
RICHARD STONEMAN 3

'The Last Days of Alexander' in an Arabic Popular Romance of Al-Iskandar
FAUSTINA DOUFIKAR - AERTS 23

Lucius and Aesop Gain a Voice: Apul. Met. *11.1-2 and* Vita Aesopi *7*
ELLEN FINKELPEARL 37

The Grand Vizier, the Prophet, and the Satirist. Transformations of the Oriental Ahiqar *Romance in Ancient Prose Fiction*
MARKO MARINČIČ 53

Living Portraits and Sculpted Bodies in Chariton's Theater of Romance
FROMA I. ZEITLIN 71

Spectator and Spectacle in Apuleius
NIALL W. SLATER 85

Plato's Dream: Philosophy and Fiction in the Theaetetus
KATHRYN MORGAN 101

Fiction as a Discourse of Philosophy in Lucian's Verae Historiae
ANDREW LAIRD 115

The Representation of Violence in the Greek Novels and Martyr Accounts
CATHRYN CHEW 129

Three Death Scenes in Apollonius of Tyre
STELIOS PANAYOTAKIS 143

PART TWO: *THE ANCIENT NOVEL IN FOCUS*

Swordplay - Wordplay: Phraseology of Fiction in Apuleius' Metamorphoses
WYTSE KEULEN 161

Nymphs, Neighbours and Narrators: a Narratological Approach to Longus
JOHN MORGAN 171

Reading for Pleasure: Narrative, Irony, and Eroticism in Achilles Tatius
TIM WHITMARSH 191

The Winged Ass. Intertextuality and Narration in Apuleius' Metamorphoses
LUCA GRAVERINI 207

Tlepolemus the Spectral Spouse
DONALD LATEINER 219

Epic Extremities: The Openings and Closures of Books in Apuleius' Metamorphoses
STEPHEN HARRISON 239

In mediis rebus: Beginning Again in the Middle of the Ancient Novel
STEPHEN NIMIS 255

La lettre dans le roman grec ou les liaisons dangereuses
FRANÇOISE LÉTOUBLON 271

The Role of Inscriptions in Greco-Roman Novels
ERKKI SIRONEN 289

Strategies of Authentication in Ancient Popular Literature
WILLIAM HANSEN 301

PART THREE: *BEYOND THE ANCIENT NOVEL*

Archaic Iambos and Greek Novel: A Possible Connection
GIUSEPPE ZANETTO 317

Resistant (and enabling) Reading: Petronius' Satyricon *and Latin Love Elegy*
JUDITH HALLETT 329

La mise en scène déclamatoire chez les romanciers latins
DANIELLE VAN MAL - MAEDER 345

Der byzantinische Roman des 12. Jahrhunderts als Spiegel des zeitgenössischen Literaturbetriebs
RUTH HARDER 357

Static Imitation or Creative Transformation? Achilles Tatius in Hysmine & Hysminias
INGELA NILSSON 371

The 'Entführung aus dem Serail'-motif in the Byzantine (vernacular) Romances
WILLEM J. AERTS 381

Staging the Fringe Before Shakespeare: Hans Sachs and the Ancient Novel
NIKLAS HOLZBERG 393

Heliodor, Mademoiselle de Scudéry und Umberto Eco: Lektüren des Liebesromans in L'isola del giorno prima
GÜNTER BERGER 401

From Petronius to Petrolio*:* Satyricon *as a Model-Experimental Novel*
MASSIMO FUSILLO 413

Myths of Person and Place: the Search for a Model for the Ancient Greek Novel
GARETH SCHMELING 425

Notes on contributors 443

Abbreviations 449

General bibliography 450

Index 485

This page intentionally left blank

PREFACE

The Ancient Novel and Beyond presents a selection of the papers read at the International Conference on the Ancient Novel (ICAN 2000), held at the University of Groningen in July 2000.[1] The papers have all been thoroughly revised and rewritten by the authors for this book. The editors have made it their aim to select from the 100 or so papers presented at ICAN 2000 a sample of 30 essays which together should offer as accurate a representation as possible of those issues that were prominent in the programme of the conference.

In an impressive Review Article, published in 1995,[2] John Morgan pointed to the two previous International Conferences on the Ancient Novel as important landmarks in the rapidly expanding and dynamic field of research on the Ancient Novels.[3] He also took stock of the results of this research at the end of the twentieth century, and indicated some directions which future research should take, and which he, judging from recent work, could see beginning to stand out. Another seven years have passed since Morgan's review appeared, and we are now looking back to a third ICAN. It will be of interest to offer a general assessment here of the various approaches that have received emphasis in the work on the Ancient Novels over the past years, and that therefore figure in this collection.

The holding of the second ICAN in 1989 had not only proved that the ancient novels had received a permanent and deserved place on the map of international studies. The Dartmouth conference had also, as has often been remarked, celebrated the relevance of modern criti-

---

[1] Most of the other papers have since then been published in various journals, for instance in the new journal *Ancient Narrative* (AN). The initiative for this electronic journal (featuring annual printed volumes as well) was announced and presented at a lively final session of ICAN 2000, and at the end of the same year the first trial issue (number 0) was published (www.ancientnarrative.com; publisher: Roelf Barkhuis). Since 2001, several issues of AN have appeared on the Web. The printed volumes are published from 2002 on.

[2] Morgan J.R., 'Review Article. The Ancient Novel at the End of the Century: Scholarship since the Dartmouth Conference,' *CP* 90 (1995), 63-73.

[3] ICAN I was held in 1976, organized by Bryan Reardon, in Bangor, South Wales, UK; the proceedings are published in Reardon (1977); ICAN II was held in 1989, organized by James Tatum, at Dartmouth College, Hanover, NH, USA; the proceedings are published in Tatum and Vernazza (1990); a selection of essays based on papers presented at ICAN II has been published in Tatum (1994).

cal approaches to the ancient novels. Literary theory, for instance narratological models, speech-act theory, reader-response criticism, and modern approaches to intertextuality, is now fully at home in the study of the ancient novels.[4] From those essays in this volume which employ theoretical models, it becomes immediately evident that careful and judicious use of literary theory, combined with thorough traditional scholarship, yields results which go far beyond just a theoretical approach per se. This is manifest for instance in the essays by John Morgan and Tim Whitmarsh: both begin their exploration of Longus and Achilles Tatius respectively with a narratological analysis. The essay by Judith Hallett, combining one of the approaches of modern feminist criticism with intertextual analysis, uncovers in Petronius' novel a 'resistant reading' of Latin love elegy.

Much has been written throughout the final decades of the twentieth century about the question of the genre of the ancient novels, but approaches have differed considerably. At first, being able to define the ancient novels as a genre, and thus as a 'precursor' of the modern literary genre of the novel, was of paramount importance in the struggle to rehabilitate these long-neglected or even despised prose texts of the early Empire. Such rehabilitating strategies are no longer called for, because the ancient novels and the related texts have become accepted objects of serious study, and have, in a review of 1993, even been labelled "one of the hottest properties in town."[5] Still, the circumstance that ancient literary theory does not recognize the genre of the novel continues to give rise to various strategies for addressing the problem of genre. It has proved extremely fruitful for an understanding of the ancient embedding and backgrounds of these extended texts of fictional prose to examine ancient theories of fiction.[6] Work in this field continues, as is attested by two essays in this volume that address the issue of ancient philosophy and fiction (Kathryn Morgan and Andrew Laird). Other approaches to the issue of the genre of the ancient novels had taken their cue from Bakhtin's theoretical works which through translations in the second half of the twentieth century had become known to a wider public. In his discus-

[4] Fusillo (1996) has listed, and commented on various modern critical theories and their relevance for the interpretation of the ancient novels

[5] Bowie E.L., Harrison S.J., 'The Romance of the Novel', *JRS* 83 (1993), 159-178.

[6] See the thoughtful discussion in Reardon (1991); an important and illuminating collection of essays is found in Gill, Wiseman (1993).

sion of the novels' 'dialogic imagination', Bakhtin included discu s-sion of several ancient novels.[7] Selden's influential article of 1994, drawing from general, modern discussions of genre as a mainly ideological construction, argued that calling these ancient texts 'novels' is a modern projection. Instead one should see these ancient forms as places where different genres meet through 'syllepsis'.[8] On the other hand, Margaret Anne Doody's book of 1996, by means of an elaborate and fascinating exploration of several unifying traits and tropes, argued that, from the ancient novels to the novels of our own epoch the form " ... had constantly contained within itself all its potential ... like the eggs in an infant's ovaries."[9] It has, however, rightly been objected that Doody's definition of the novel is "... si m-ply too general to be useful."[10] At ICAN 2000, Bracht Branham, in the introduction to a paper on 'Representing Time in Ancient Fiction,' commented on the limitations of some of the most influential theses on the origins and nature on the novel, which tend to ignore, marginalize, or conflate the varieties of ancient fiction; he then discussed the problem of the origin and nature of genres given Bakhtin's distinctive understanding of language as a social activity. In his opinion, the ancient novels "provide interesting precedents for what have usually been considered some of the modern and early modern novel's distinguishing features – such as contemporaneity and certain kinds of realism."[11] In this collection, several essays address the issue of genre through various approaches. Thus, for instance, Fusillo, pointing to Pasolini's *Petrolio* and Petronius' *Satyrica* as both 'Menippean' in character, emphasizes that 'Menippean' as a theoret i-cal concept may still be useful, provided that one considers it not a literary 'genre', but "a cultural trend spanning various eras and ge n-res ... ." Schmeling's essay, too, addresses questions of genre in the course of a comparison of characters and situations in some Greek novels with similar characters and circumstances in American novels about the Southern Belles.

---

[7] For a thorough discussion of the importance of Bakhtin's work for the research of the ancient novels see Branham (2002); see also Branham (1995).

[8] Selden (1994).

[9] Doody (1996) 298.

[10] Thus Branham (2002) 2, n. 1, reacting to Doody's words (1996) 16: "A work is a novel if it is fiction, if it is prose, and if it is of a certain length."

[11] This quotation is partly from the abstract by Branham in Zimmerman, Panayotakis, Keulen (2000) 12 f., partly from Branham (2002).

One of the other speakers at ICAN 2000, Simon Goldhill, provocatively claimed that the issue of genre, useful though it was for the novel, "has had its day." The point of that paper was, that thin king in terms of 'genre' distorts the question of history and of cultural work too much. It was argued that it is more necessary and fruitful, instead of "ring fencing the ancient novels ... with the electric fence of genre" to put them back into their cultural and historical setting.[12] As a matter of fact, in the decades before ICAN 2000 studying the ancient novels and related texts in their contexts had already come to stand out as a main strand in current scholarship. This important development, of course, could not and did not make the ever-important methodical scholarly work of traditional philology and history on the texts themselves, the editions, the commentaries, and the lexicological studies, superfluous. Increasingly, scholarly attention has also been directed to those works of ancient prose fiction that lay outside the 'canon' of the five complete Greek novels and the three Latin novels.[13] Also work on the fragments, textual and interpretive, continues to be of great importance.[14] Besides being impossible, it would be tedious to list here the overwhelming amount of recent publications which attest to these developments. Not only will the notes to the essays in the present collection list references to recent publications, also the bibliography in this field has always been conveniently made accessible in the annual issues of the *Petronian Society Newsletter*.[15]

The developments sketched above have been the leading motivation behind the organizers' decision to give ICAN 2000 a subtitle: 'The Ancient Novel in Context.' With this subtitle we meant, however, much more various and comprehensive contexts than only the

[12] The abstract of Goldhill's paper may be found in Zimmerman, Panayotakis, Keulen (2000) 36.

[13] See e.g. the well-documented contributions by Niklas Holzberg in Schmeling (1996), and by Stefan Merkle on the fictional works of 'Dictys' and 'Dares', also in Schmeling (1996).

[14] Kussl (1991); Stramaglia (1990; 1991; 1992a; 1992b; 1993; 1998); López Martínez (1998); Stephens, Winkler (1995); see Morgan (1998).

[15] The *Petronian Society Newsletter* (*PSN*, edited by Gareth Schmeling) had since volume 11 (1981) expanded its scope to include the bibliographical reports of all ancient prose fiction. Since 2001, Gareth Schmeling publishes the *PSN* within the new electronic journal *Ancient Narrative* (*AN*: www.ancientnarrative.com). In *AN* all previous issues of *PSN* are collected in the electronic archive, thanks to the efforts of Jean Alvares.

context of second century prose for which Goldhill in his above-mentioned paper opted. This will be apparent from those essays which in this volume have been combined within Part One: 'The Ancient Novel in Context.' The first four essays all address, from different angles, the novels' affinities with Eastern traditions: Richard Stoneman and Faustina Doufikar-Aerts on the Alexander Romance; Ellen Finkelpearl on contacts between Apuleius' novel and the *Life of Aesop*; Marco Marinčič on transformations of the Ahiquar Romance in ancient prose fiction. A second intriguing context for the ancient novels is the context of spectacle, addressed in the next two essays by Froma Zeitlin and Niall Slater. The expanded fortunes of the theater, theatrical, image making and the rhetoric of vision and iconicity in the culture of the Roman empire from its earliest stages onward are at the centre of the essay by Zeitlin. Slater reads Apuleius' novel in terms of the power of the spectator; he traces an ever more powerful objectification (from the privileged position of spectator toward spectacle) of this novel's protagonist. In the next two essays, Kathryn Morgan and Andrew Laird place ancient fictional discourses in the context of philosophical attitudes to fiction. It will come as no surprise that both these essays are centered around Plato's dialogues: Plato as a literary artist and as a writer of fictional dialogues figured prominently in philosophical as well as in literary discourse of the second century A.D.[16] Morgan's essay, while concentrating on Plato's *Theaetetus*, gives us a helpful theoretical background for understanding philosophical attitudes to fictionality and illusion. Laird, on the other hand, concentrating on the fictional text of Lucian's *Verae Historiae* discusses Plato's *Republic* as an illuminating background for Lucian's work.

The small but growing area of scholarship on Ancient Fiction and Early Christian and Jewish Narrative formed another context which had been placed prominently in our call for papers for ICAN 2000. In this area much has happened over the past decades, as those who read the regular reports by Ronald Hock in the *Petronian Society Newsletter*, are aware.[17] We are glad to offer two essays that address this

[16] See e.g. Flinterman 2002 on Aelius Aristides' discussion of Plato's dialogues as 'largely fictions," with further references.

[17] See Hock R.F., 'Recent Literature on the Greek Novel and Early Christian Literature', in *PSN* 30 (2000) 9 f., with references to reports in previous issues of *PSN*; the most recent report by Ronald Hock has appeared in the first electronic issue of

area (Kathryn Chew and Stelios Panayotakis); these two essays may help to fulfill the often expressed expectations that investigating those two traditions in combination, Ancient Fiction and Early Christian Fiction in all its forms, will illuminate both. The organizers of ICAN 2000 were surprised that not more papers on these subjects had been submitted; it may be noted that the contribution by Marko Marinčič in this volume addresses the relationship between Ancient Fiction and Jewish Narrative. It is to be hoped that the new medium of *Ancient Narrative* (see above, note 1), will help to promote contacts between students in those fields.[18]

In the essays combined in Part Two of this volume, 'The Ancient Novel in Focus,' two things are apparent: first, that, as remarked above, the texts of the ancient novels themselves will rightly remain in focus as a corpus of writings which merit to be investigated for their intrinsic literary value. Second, practically all the papers collected here, apart from focussing on the texts themselves, are at the same time studying them in one or another context. Thus, Wytse Keulen shows Apuleius, especially in the strongly programmatic first chapters of his novel, manifesting himself as a sophist treating his audience to a performance of rhetorical prestidigitation, as a true representative of the so-called movement of the Second Sophistic; John Morgan's essay, analysing the different narrative layers in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*, none of which is systematically privileged above the other, argues that the author in this respect, by fragmenting authority, is in full conformity with Hellenistic poetics. The difficulty of reading this multivocal and unstable text, Morgan maintains, is an aspect of its subtle didacticism. And the essay by Tim Whitmarsh, focussing on Achilles Tatius' novel, arrives at situating this text in a self-consciously marginal, oblique relationship to the wider literary culture of its period. Both the essays by Luca Graverini and Don Lateiner focus on the one hand on Apuleius' novel, but in such a way that this text is shown to entertain an intriguing dialogue with preceding literature, Greek as well as Latin.

The next two essays by Stephen Harrison and Stephen Nimis concentrate on matters of structure: Harrison, by discussing book-openings and book-closures of Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*, illustrates

---

PSN, vol. 31 (2001: url: www.ancientnarrative.com/PSN/articles&reviews.htm); an important collection is Hock, Bradley Chance, Perkins (1998).

[18] See the important suggestions in Van Bekkum (2002).

the ways in which this novel constantly looks back to epic as a model for continuous narrative, but also constantly differentiates itself by parody and the like from its more 'dignified' literary ancestor. Since Nimis' essay is about new beginnings in the middle of novels, we have placed in the middle of this volume. Taking off from Bakhtin's *Dialogic Imagination*, and from his own work on 'The Prosaics of the Novel,'[19] Nimis shows, with examples from Chariton and Longus, that often in the middle of a novel a sort of reassessment coincides with a new beginning, a place of both temporary closure or evaluation and of some opening up of new possibilities.

Within Part Two three more essays finally explore the presence of 'texts within the texts' of the novels: Françoise Létoublon analyses the functioning of various types of letters written by characters within the novels, and argues that some of the Greek novels, in their use of written letters, may indeed be considered as forerunners of some of the great epistolary novels of XVIIIth century France. Erkki Sironen, on the other hand, evaluates the importance of inscriptions in a number of ancient novelistic texts, especially in the early, post-Hellenistic prose fictions, where the use of inscriptions as 'validating documents' can be considered to go back to the quoting of more or less fictitious inscriptions by historians like Herodotus, Thucydides and Xenophon. As stated above, in Part Two most of the essays place the novels on which they focus in a wider socio-cultural or literary context. This is especially the case with the final essay of Part Two, in which William Hansen considers forms and strategies of pseudo-documentarism in Greek and Roman popular literature of the imperial period, including, but not limited to, novels.

In Part Three, entitled 'Beyond the Ancient Novels,' even wider—and often surprising—contexts of the ancient novels are addressed. In the first three papers of this part, the ancient novels are shown as adopting, re-using, and creatively processing other types of ancient literature. Giuseppe Zanetto makes a case for archaic iambos as a meaningful subtext in some passages of Greek novels. The contribution by Judith Hallett uncovers in Petronius' novel a 'resistant reading' of Latin love elegy. Through a discussion of passages from Horace's satires, Hallett shows that there is a precedent in Roman satire for problematizing the scenarios and assumptions of Roman el-

[19] Bakhtin (1981); Nimis (1994); (1998); (1999).

egy. Petronius, it is argued, is expanding on Horace's genre-based critique. The essay of Danielle van Mal-Maeder points out that several characters in Apuleius' novel are reminiscent of stock types in Roman Declamation; Apuleius in those cases often appears to 'outbid' the declamators in inventiveness.

In several essays of this section various aspects of the rich afterlife of the novels are discussed. There has been "a remarkable revival of the previously much deprecated Byzantine novels in the last years," remarked Corinne Jouanno in 2000.[20] This trend is illustrated in our volume by three essays, which discuss several novels from the Byzantine Middle Age in the context of the literary culture of their time (Ruth Harder), or as creatively handling ancient models (Ingela Nilsson), or as taking up time-honoured motifs like e.g. the motif of the 'Entführung aus dem Serail' (Willem Aerts). The ancient novels have also been sources of inspiration in pre-modern, early modern and modern literature. Thus, Niklas Holzberg's paper informs us about the Nürnberg Meistersinger and dramatist Hans Sachs (1494-1576), who, as is shown in this essay, has re-told the stories he took from ancient novels in a new form while at the same time making full use of their didactic possibilities. The next three essays in various ways look at ancient novels from the perspective of modern fiction. Günter Berger discusses the intricate intertextual games that Umberto Eco in his novel *L'isola del giorno prima* plays with—among other texts—both the ancient novel of Heliodorus and M. de Scudéry's *Clélie*. The essay thus testifies to the lasting impact of Heliodorus' ancient novel—through its reception in early modern times—on modern fictional literature. Massimo Fusillo discusses the posthumously published fragments of Pasolini's *Petrolio* as a 'modern Satyricon'; Pasolini's Petronian rewriting is then compared with other examples of modern 'Menippean' texts, and with the transformations of the European experimental novel. Gareth Schmeling's essay elucidates several puzzling aspects of the genre of the ancient novels by looking at a subspecies of the contemporary American novels about the ante-bellum South, novels, in which the female protagonists are referred to as Southern Belles. This final essay is not meant to make a case for any direct intertextual relationship. It should make the reader think: here is a comparison of novels separated by eighteen to nineteen hundred

[20] C. Jouanno, 'The Byzantine Novel,' *PSN* 30, (2000) 11 f.

years, and yet there are all these close parallels without any direct borrowings.

ICAN 2000, the conference itself, and the present collection of articles resulting from that momentous gathering, convincingly show that the ancient novels, indeed, do have a future. It is to be hoped that a next conference within a few years will show that new directions, aired for the first time at ICAN 2000, will have gained ground, and that at such a conference, again, as was the case in 2000, it will become apparent where the study of the ancient novels will be headed from that point onward. Perhaps the fourth ICAN will be not an International Conference on the Ancient Novel, but an International Conference on Ancient Narrative.

This page intentionally left blank

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The editors want to express their gratitude to the Royal Dutch Academy of Sciences (KNAW), who at an early stage of the preparations for the conference, had recognized ICAN 2000 as a STAR Congress (Science, Technology and Art Recognition Congress). This recognition implied substantial financial support. We also want to thank the Dutch Organization for Scientific Research (NWO) and the Groningen University Fund (GUF) for their help. When, after the conference, the financial ends did not meet, it was thanks to the gracious intervention of Justa Renner, subdirector of the Classics Department of the Faculty of Arts of the University of Groningen, that the Instituut voor Cultuurwetenschappelijk Onderzoek Groningen (ICOG) was prepared to lend the necessary financial support after the event. Our debt of gratitude to both Justa Renner and the ICOG is great.

With gratitude we remember the multiple support and advice we received from the members of the International Conference Committee during the preparations of ICAN 2000. In the course of the conference itself, a team of student helpers provided invaluable practical assistance. Well before the conference, one of the students, Marloes Otter, joined our organizing committee, and we thank her warmly for her enthusiastic and cheerful cooperation.

The editors want to address a special word of thanks to the anonymous reader of Brill; this volume has benefited a great deal from the detailed and thoughtful comments we received.

Last but not least, conferences like ICAN 2000, and the publication of proceedings like the present one, are only possible thanks to the unswerving enthusiasm of the participants, the speakers and the authors. We thank them all for their unstinting participation and cooperation, and their sympathetic compliance with our various requests.

Groningen, February 2003

This page intentionally left blank

PART ONE

THE ANCIENT NOVEL IN CONTEXT

This page intentionally left blank

ALEXANDER THE GREAT IN THE ARABIC TRADITION

Richard Stoneman

Introduction

Alexander the Great is an important figure in Arabic literature.[1] Incidental mentions of him, either under his own name (al-Iskandar) or as Dhu'l-qarnain, 'the two-horned one,' appear from the earliest times, even in pre-Islamic poetry; he features in the Qur'an and, later, in a number of stories in Mas'udi (d. 956 CE) and others. Furthermore, stories originally associated with him have found their way into Arabic literature in association with other characters: for example, Qazvini mentions him as the discoverer of the Valley of Diamonds,[2] famous from the story of Sindbad the Sailor, while the stories of predatory women, trees with human heads for fruit, and the Putrid Sea in the book of Captain Buzurg ibn Shahriyar (MS of 13th c.) have their origin in the *Alexander Romance*.[3] Alexander's flight is the source of Sindbad's;[4] his search for the water of life reappears in the story of Buluqiya in the Arabian nights (though attempts have been made to carry this motif back to the dawn of literature in the Epic of Gilgamesh).[5] Thirdly, Alexander is prominent in two important works with a long subsequent influence in both Islam and the West: the Secret of Secrets (originally by Yahya ibn Bitriq, d. 815 CE), consisting of letters addressed to him by Aristotle, and the Sayings of the Philosophers (by Hunayn ibn Ishaq, 809-873), in which he appears as subject of the sayings and, sometimes, as an author of wise sayings, an aspect which we encounter elsewhere in Arabic lit-

[1] General Bibliography: *EI*[2] s.v. Iskandar, Dhu'l–qarnain; Irwin (1994); Doufikar-Aerts (1994); Bridges, Bürgel (1996); Waugh (1996); de Polignac (1982).

[2] Lane (1859) III 88 f.; Boulnois (1966) 161: the story appears first in Epiphanius *De Gemmis* 30 f.

[3] See Irwin (1994) 72; Gerhardt (1963) 238 on Sindbad and Alexander; Buzurg ibn Shahriyar (1928).

[4] Von Grunebaum (1953) 299-303.

[5] Dalley (1991); Stoneman (1992) is sceptical.

erature.[6] Fourthly, he appears frequently in anecdotes and exempla in such works as the thirteenth century *Livre des Ruses* and in al-Ghazzali. Finally, he is the subject of several full-length narratives, dating variously from the first Islamic centuries to the fifteenth century of our era,[7] which appear to derive ultimately from the Alexander Romance of Pseudo-Callisthenes and its Syriac variants and developments. But no direct Arabic translation of the Pseudo-Callisthenes has ever been found. There have been a number of hypotheses concerning the transmission of the Greek original to its Arabic versions,[8] all of which have concentrated on the search for a single translation of the Greek or Syriac original into Arabic at an early date, as a source for the later treatments.

In this paper I shall consider the routes of transmission of the figure of Alexander into Arabic lore and literature, concentrating on the period from the sixth to the ninth centuries of the Christian era. Some major authors, such as al-Tabari, Dinawari and al-Tha'alabi, will thus be excluded from discussion. I hope to propose some answers to the question of why the Arabs were interested in Alexander, and what they made of him when they made him their own. In the process several problems will need to be addressed.

The Enclosed Nations, Gog and Magog

The first appearance of Alexander the Great is in the Qur'an (Sura 18), in the story of his building of the wall to enclose the unclean nations of Gog and Magog. Gog and Magog first appear in the Bible (*Genesis* 10.2, *Ezekiel* 38.1-3, *Revelation* 20.7-8; cf. Josephus *AJ* 1.123) as enemies of civilization. Their enclosure behind a wall by Alexander is first mentioned in classical literature by Jerome (*Ep.*

[6] *The Secret of Secrets*: for a guide see Manzalaoui (1977) and for a survey, Ryan, Schmitt (1982). On *The sayings of the Philosophers* see Brock (1970); Buehler (1941); Brocker (1966). Hunayn's work is preserved only in a version by al-Ansari.

[7] (1) 'Umara ibn Zayd, BM* Add MS 5928: see Friedlaender (1913); (2) Wahb ibn Munabbih: see Lidzbarski (1893); Nagel (1978); (3) Berlin cod. Arab. 9118: see Weymann (1901); (4) Mubashshir ibn Fatik: see Meissner (1895) 583-627; (5) *Historia de Dulcarnein*: see Garcia Gomez (1929); (6) Istanbul MS 1466, essentially the same as the Malay version translated by Van Leeuwen (1937); (7) Ibn Suweidan, text of 1666 (based on the Byzantine prose version): see Trumpf (1974), Lolos (1983) and Konstantinopulos (1983).

[8] Nöldeke (1890); Weymann (1901); Friedlaender (1913); Gero (1993); Fahd (1991); Abbott (1957); also the editions cited in note 7.

77.8), and was well known by the sixth century when it appears in some Syriac versions of the Alexander legend.[9]

The content of the Syriac Romance is closely similar to that of the alpha-recension of Pseudo-Callisthenes (datable to before 338 CE) which does not include the story of the search for the Water of Life. The Syriac Romance adds an embassy to the Emperor of China and some other details. E.A. Wallis Budge estimated its composition as seventh or eighth century, but it seems more likely that it belongs to the complex of activity in sixth or early seventh century Syria, when Syrian culture became somewhat more hellenized and other Greek works were translated into Syriac.[10]

But this is not the only Syriac narrative concerning Alexander. Besides a ‘Brief Life’ (Wallis Budge 159-61), there are two significant texts: the ‘Christian Legend concerning Alexander’ (Wallis Budge 144-58) and a poem attributed to Jacob of Serugh with similar content (Wallis Budge 163-200). The two latter contain stories quite significantly different from the Syriac Romance. The Legend concentrates on a sea-voyage by Alexander, at the end of which he constructs a gate of brass and iron to enclose the wicked nations Gog and Magog, who in a speech by Alexander are identified with the Huns. Alexander takes captive king Tubarlaq of Persia, and then travels to Jerusalem; after which his death is briefly mentioned. The Poem also describes Alexander’s journey into the Land of Darkness and the discovery of the Water of Life; he hears of Gog and Magog, conquers Tubarlaq, and then builds a gate to enclose Gog and Magog. An angel prophesies to him the coming of Gog and Magog and Antichrist, and the end of the world; Alexander conveys this prophecy to his people.

There are some pointers to the dating of both these texts. The Christian Legend refers to the Khazar invasion of Armenia which took place in 628 (all dates are CE unless otherwise indicated),[11] so it

[9] Texts with translation are assembled by Wallis Budge (1889); also Reinink (1983).

[10] Brock (1982); Whitby (1992). Nöldeke (1890) formed the hypothesis that the translation was made via a Pahlavi (Middle Persian) intermediary; but Frye (1985) and especially Ciancaglini (1998) have shown that this hypothesis cannot be maintained. The Syriac version was made directly from the Greek. It has been thought to represent a separate lost recension, delta*, but it is possible that the divergences from alpha were introduced by the Syriac translator. On the history of the recensions see, briefly, Stoneman (1991) 28-31.

[11] Wallis Budge (1889) 149; Gero (1993).

may reasonably be assumed that the work was composed when this invasion was still hot news. The Poem appears to have been composed with knowledge of the Legend, and has been plausibly dated by Reinink to the years 628-636;[12] he regards it as a work composed as 'propaganda' for Heraclius, then engaged on his campaigns against enemies in the east. Heraclius' activities were seen in eschatological terms as harbingers of a regeneration of the Roman Empire.[13] These involved both successful campaigns against Persia under its king Chosroes II (= Tubarlaq) and unsuccessful campaigns against the Arabs. Because neither of the works mentions the capture of Jerusalem by 'Umar in 636 it may be assumed that the works were written down before that cataclysmic event.

The events described in the Legend and the Poem also play an important part in the Apocalypse of Pseudo-Methodius, which was composed in Syriac and translated back into Greek, in which form it directly entered the later recensions of the Greek Alexander Romance.[14] The relevant section is VIII, which describes the enclosure of Gog and Magog by Alexander the Great and their subsequent irruption into the world in the Last Days.[15] This work is clearly an adaptation of the Alexander legend to the situation of the Islamic conquests, and it is further Christianised by giving Alexander a descent from the kings of Ethiopia rather than from Philip or the Egyptian Nectanebo as in the Greek versions and the Syriac Romance. Ps.-Methodius reflects a more catastrophic situation, after the Battle of the Yarmuk and the Capture of Jerusalem in 636. Dates for Ps.-Methodius have been proposed ranging from the 640s to 690 (the real Methodius died in 311), and at present the date of 692 seems to be winning the consensus:[16] the work was composed when Arab rule in

---

[12] Reinink (1983).

[13] Whitby (1992).

[14] On Ps.Methodius see Reinink (1992 and 1993); Palmer (1993) (including partial translation of the apocalypse by S. Brock, 222); Aerts, Kortekaas (1998); and of the earlier literature Kampers (1901); Kmosko (1931); Czegledy (1957); Lolos (1976) and (1978); Suermann (1985); Alexander (1985 and 1973).

[15] The motif is repeated in the Edessene fragment (Palmer [1993] 243-50) and there is a similar propaganda in the Gospel of the Twelve Apostles.

[16] Reinink (1988). See McGinn (1994) xxi; and for earlier datings 70. Brock in Palmer (1993) 225; Suermann (1985). On the whole topic see Alexander (1985).

Syria was already well established but could still be seen as liable to a dramatic end.[17]

However, it is clear that the legend of Alexander's search for the Water of Life and his enclosure of Gog and Magog was quite widely known in Arab circles from the earliest days of the conquests and before. The pre-Islamic poet al-'Asha alluded to the enclosure of Gog and Magog,[18] and the poet Imru'l-Qays (Diwan 158) referred to a Yemeni hero who undertook a similar campaign against Gog and Magog.[19] Ibn Abd al-Hakam (d. 871 CE) recalls the Alexander story and uses his adventures in a description of a companion of the Prophet. More significantly for the long-term development of the legends, both the main elements of the Syriac legend and Poem are the theme of Sura 18 of the Qur'an, 'The Cave.' Muhammad died in 632, and while scholars dispute how much content may have been added to the Qur'an in the process of editing what he left behind,[20] it seems likely that the substance of this story was circulating in oral form before 632. Of course in the Qur'an the implied link of Gog and Magog with the Islamic conquests is entirely absent![21]

The Name of Alexander/Dhu'l-qarnain

At this point it is necessary to clarify the issue of nomenclature. The legend is told in the Greek and Syriac sources about Alexander, but in the Qur'an it is attributed to Dhu'l-qarnain, 'the two-horned one.' How sure can we be that the two figures are the same? Many Qur'anic scholars have disputed the identification, and it is necessary to pick apart carefully the strands of development, which are the source of some confusions in discussions of the Arabic Alexander.

---

[17] Other Christian writers express similar anxiety that their God is letting them down after the Yarmuk. They include the late seventh-century Armenian historian Sebeos: see Thomson (1999) and the comments of Kaegi (1992) 231-8; also Witakowski (1987). Muslim writers equally worried about a possible Byzantine reconquest of Syria, which they interpreted in similar apocalyptic terms: Bashear (1991).

[18] Al-Asha: Nicholson (1907) 17-18.

[19] Ashtiany (1990) 138-9.

[20] The Qur'an was probably completed in the reign of 'Uthman (644-656); Cook (1983) 67.

[21] The other reference to Gog and Magog in the Qur'an 21.96 is based on the Old Testament tradition.

Alexander's normal designation in Arabic literature is Dhu'l-qarnain, 'the two-horned one.' In Persian, even when the story in question is one of Arabic origin, his designation is Iskandar, which is a back-formation from Alexander on the assumption that the initial Al- is the Arabic prefix-article. In general, however, the designation al-Iskandar is used by Arab authors only in stories of Persian origin. Clarity is not helped by the tendency of modern translators to use either term without indicating which is used in their source text.[22]

The designation Dhu'l-qarnain stems from the Qur'an, Sura 18, the second part of which is an answer to a problem raised thus: "They will ask you concerning Dhu'l-qarnain" (82 ff.). The commentators on the Qur'an universally assumed that Dhu'l-qarnain here is a name of Alexander, but were at a loss to understand the term, and thus give a wide variety of explanations. Their assumption was clearly correct, since the two stories here associated with Dhu'l-qarnain are precisely those two associated with Alexander in the Syriac Legend of Alexander, current shortly before the composition of the Qur'an. In addition, the pre-Islamic poet Al-'Asha and the contemporary of Muhammad Hassan ibn Thabit both composed verses referring to the conquest of Gog and Magog and the furthest east by Dhu'l-qarnain.[23]

It would appear therefore that the two names were already synonymous when Muhammad came to compose this sura of the Qur'an. The most plausible explanation for this would seem to be found in the iconography of Alexander, who was regularly represented on coins, in Egyptian statues, and in other representations, as wearing the horns of the Egyptian god Ammon.[24]

However, the question which was posed to Muhammad by the Jews was a different one. They were requesting an explanation of the figure of the two-horned one in the prophecy of *Daniel* 8. Now modern commentators are generally agreed that the ram with two horns in this passage represents Cyrus the Great who released the Jews from the captivity in Babylon, while the goat with one horn represents Alexander the Great. It would appear that Muhammad has confused these two figures, under the influence of the prevailing iconography

[22] E.g. Tabari (1987); Friedlaender (1913). General discussion: Brocker (1966) 84 f.

[23] Cf. note 19.

[24] Macuch (1989); cf. idem (1991).

of Alexander with two horns, and attached the designation to the wrong king.[25]

The result was that all subsequent Arab writers, for whom Muhammad's utterances had the status of sacred truth, used this designation for Alexander the Great.

The commentators were bemused by the apparent existence of two Dhu'l-qarnains,[26] the authors of Alexander Romances and general histories were not too bothered by their problems, and continue to attach the name of Dhu'l-qarnain to the exploits attached to the historical Alexander: the identification is established already in Dinawari and in ath-Tha'alabi (961-1038), and consequently in later authors.[27]

Alexander's Wall

The existence of the wall, which Alexander had built against the enclosed nations, became an article of belief for the Muslims of the period immediately following Mohammed. Before the year 740 Abd el-Malik made a point of visiting it.[28] Its location was apparently generally known, for the Caliph Wathiq sent an expedition to repair it in 842-844. The wall was a real one, but the narrative is fantastical.[29]

> The story is in Ibn Khordadbeh: "Sallam the Interpreter told me this: Wathiq, having seen that the wall built by Alexander between us and Gog-Magog was cracked, sent someone to report on the matter. Ashnas [a Turkish chief] told him that the only one for the job was Sallam the Interpreter, who spoke thirty languages. So Wathiq called me. "I want you to go," he said, "and see the wall with your own eyes, and

[25] Macuch (1991).

[26] On the commentators' discussions see Endress (1968-9); Walbridge (1999) 256 note 4; Southgate (1978) app. P. 201. The puzzle became a topos. A series of learned jests by al-Jahiz (776-868), 'the goggle-eyed,' directed at Ahmad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhab, asks such questions as "Is the giraffe the offspring of a female camel and a hyen," "Is Jeremiah Khidr?" and "Is Dhu'l-qarnain Alexander?" See Dunlop (1971) 48.

[27] Irwin (1994) 88 for another example.

[28] Norris (1983).

[29] Miquel (1975) II 498; from Wilson (1922). The location of the wall was not always known. Qamus al-a'lam thought it was the Great Wall of China (Macuch [1991] 247; cf Wilson [1922], Waldron [1990]). See also Burton (1934) III 1893-4. Dunlop (1971) 167 f. suggests that Sallam did visit the Great Wall of China, or at least the Tien Shan mountains, in the process of investigating the effects of the collapse of Uighur civilization.

> report back." He allotted me fifty men, young and strong, gave me 5000 dinars plus a personal credit for 10,000 dirhams, each of the fifty men receiving an advance of 1000 dirhams and a year's salary.
>
> We stayed a day and a night with the king of the Khazars, who gave us five guides. Twenty-six days' marching brought us to a black, stinking place; we had provided ourselves in advance with vinegar, by breathing which we could protect ourselves from the frightful smell. After ten days we began to cross a region, which took 20 days to cross. It was full of cities in ruins, which we were told had been razed by Gog and Magog."

There follows a long description of the gate, and a description of the place where Alexander had made his camp, all in the most matter of fact terms. Already the story, which had originally related to the threat of Muslim invasion in a Christian land, had been adapted to represent the threat from outside to the now powerful Muslim empire. The change is of a piece with the Umayyad adaptation of the ideology of the conquered to their own purposes as rulers.[30]

The earliest Arabic Alexander Narratives

If we turn now to the earliest known Arabic narratives about Alexander/Dhu'l-qarnain we find a very different set of stories from those in the Syriac Pseudo-Callisthenes. The questions we must consider are (1) how these elements are incorporated into the long Arabic narratives and (2) whether there is to be found among them any translation of the Greek *Alexander Romance*. This latter assertion has been quite uncritically made in connection with the two major texts by more than one scholar.[31] However, the most recent survey of Arabic Alexander Romances ends in an aporia as to whether there ever existed such a version.[32] All the subsequent surviving Arabic Alexander narratives include the elements which are already in the Qur'an but which, as we have seen, were not in the Greek Pseudo-Callisthenes; rather, they were composed in Syriac circles and in the Syriac language, and found their way back into the Greek Pseudo-Callisthenes via a Greek translation of Pseudo-Methodius.

[30] Gutas (1998) *passim*.
[31] Norris (1983) 253; Abbott (1957).
[32] Samir (1998).

(i). The first full-scale narrative about Alexander to demand attention was composed by ‘Umara ibn Zayd (767-815).[33] It is a narrative of Alexander’s travels in distant lands, his search for the Water of Life, his building of the Wall against Gog and Magog, and his encounters with angels; it also incorporates stories known from Talmudic tradition, such as that of the Wonderstone.

Though some elements of the Greek Romance appear in this narrative,[34] it is clear that it takes its starting point from very different premises and interests, and can in no sense be described (as it is by Nabia Abbott) as a translation from the Greek. ‘Umara is familiar with some of the main elements of the historical career of Alexander, including his campaigns against Darius and Porus, and his meeting with the Brahmans. Huge sections of the Greek story are omitted, not only the Greek episodes but those of Candace, the Amazons, his death, and others. The Egyptian element is also very attenuated. On the other hand, several elements of known Jewish provenance are included.

(ii). Similar judgments apply to the South Arabian narrative about Alexander by Wahb ibn Munabbih, studied by Tilman Nagel.[35] Wahb was an 8th c. Yemenite author, pious and interested in the Israiliyat; he was known for the composition of qisas, in which folklore is served up as history. His work is known through the presentation by Ibn Hisham, in his *Book of Crowns concerning the Chronicles of the Kings of Himyar*. In this, Dhu’l-qarnain is identified with the Tubba’ king of Yemen, as-Sa’ab, son of al-Harit (the Arabic form of the name Grecised as Arethas, the name of all the Nabataean kings). Most of it describes Alexander’s career of conquest of infidel peoples in east and west: it also includes the story of the Water of Life, the Wall against Gog and Magog, and a visit to a castle with glass walls[36] as well as to the Brahmans (probably a better pointing of the Arabic than ‘Turkmens’).

[33] See note 7 for details. A.R. Anderson (1932) wrongly says that this is “lost”: Norris (1972) 70.

[34] More than Friedlaender indicates: Doufikar-Aerts *per litt.*

[35] Nagel (1978). On Wahb see also Doufikar-Aerts (1994) 335; Von Kremer (1866) 69-76; Duri (1983) 30-2, 122-35; Khoury (1972) I 244 with parallels from other authors.

[36] An interesting parallel to the palace with coloured glass walls in a Hebrew Romance: Gaster (1897).

This story is intended to give a parallel for, and to justify, the Islamic conquests in the west, and to expound a geography of the Arab world and its neighbours; and it represents a glorification of the South Arabian traditions and their conquests in Egypt. The division of the Arabs into North and South Arabs, with mutually hostile attitudes, began at the Battle of Marj Rahut in 680 and consolidated over the next two centuries. The historical background to this narrative dates it to the eighth century. It is interesting that the origin of the Turks is a significant ethnographic topic at this early date. The Jewish elements may derive from knowledge of Jewish traditions current among the Jews of Egypt; however, as we have seen some of the 'Jewish' elements are found also in 'Umara.[37]

Though neither of these texts can be seen as a translation of Pseudo-Callisthenes, there are several pieces of evidence, of varying weight, that a full Arabic translation of the Romance once existed. These, taken together, may take the discussion further than has previously been possible. The first is the Ethiopic recension.

(iii). Karl Weymann's hypothesis and the Ethiopic recension. In 1901 Karl Weymann drew attention to Berlin cod. arab. 9118 which contains an abbreviated version of Alexander's letter to his mother, the description of the monstrous birth which preceded Alexander's death, his death and the march past of the army. This corresponds to part of the Syriac Romance (p. 17-19 Wallis Budge). Weymann argued that this was part of a full translation of the Romance, and furthermore that the unique manuscript of a version in Ethiopic, made probably in the ??14th century (though the sole MS is of the 19th c.), was made directly from this Arabic translation. The Ethiopic version corresponds broadly to the later versions of the Greek, including the par-

[37] Many elements of these romances reappear in a biography of Alexander by as-Suri, erroneously ascribed to Ka'ab al-Ahbar (MS Aya Sofya 3003-4), a MS of 1466 CE. This is closely related to BM Add MS 7366-68 as well as to MSS Berlin 9108-9109, which is the source of the Malay Romance (Van Leeuwen 1937). Aya Sofya MS 3003-3004 was cautiously reported by Ross in his note to Cary (1967) 12 note 19 as an Arabic Pseudo-Callisthenes, and this was accepted as definitive by e.g. Rondorf-Schmucker (1984) 250; but it is not a translation of the Greek Alexander Romance. See the account by Doufikar-Aerts (2000a). The latter scholar is preparing an edition of the Aya Sofya MS. Another Romance, which follows the same complex of legends, is the Western Arabic *Historia de Dulcarnain* (Garcia Gomez [1929]), composed in Islamic Spain. The Arabic Romance of Ibn Suwaydan, dating from 1666, is a translation of the Byzantine prose romance: Lolos (1984).

entage of Nectanebo, but adds some details on the wonders of Babylon, and also some details drawn from the chronicle of Eutychius, Patriarch of Alexandria (877-940).[38] Weymann drew attention to common features in the series of events narrated by Dinawari (9th c.) and Firdausi (10th. c), and argued that both derived from this common Arabic source. He surmised that this Arabic translation was made in the early ninth century, probably during the reign of Ma'mun, the peak of Arabic literary activity. It would then have been known to Hunayn ibn Ishaq (809-873) and to Mubashshir (d. 1053). The hypothesis is attractive, but the search for such an Arabic translation has until recently been unsuccessful. The hypothesis also does not account for the fact that important features of the Greek-Syriac Romance never appear in Arabic versions—notably Alexander as son of Nectanebo—and that all the Arabic versions except those already discussed are heavily influenced by a Persian tradition in which Alexander is the son of the Persian king Dara.[39] Macuch[40] rightly points out that if there was ever a complete translation of the Pseudo-Callisthenes into Arabic, it must have been made by a Christian, as Muslim authors systematically reject the polytheistic opening of the Romance.[41] However, the recent discovery by Faustina Doufikar-Aerts of a MS including large fragments of a translation of the Alexander romance into Arabic has brought us much closer to a text of this kind: it is the strongest evidence yet found that there was a (complete?) translation of the Romance into Arabic.[42] Doufikar-Aerts has also identified an Arabic 'Letter of Alexander to Aristotle about India,' of which the original represents an important portion of the Greek Romance.[43]

---

[38] Gero (1993).

[39] This point is also made by Gero (1993) 5; Southgate (1978); Frye (1985). An exception is the work discussed by Grignaschi (1993) 228. Nectanebo is in Persian Mughmil, which must have an Arabic source, therefore even this section was translated into Arabic.

[40] Macuch (1989).

[41] A similar argument to Weymann's is that of Fahd (1991), who argues that the putative translation was incorporated in the Persian *Khuday-nameh*, which was used by Tabari. The assumption seems over-complicated.

[42] Doufikar-Aerts in this volume. A portion of the 'Last Days' section of the Romance, namely Alexander's letter of consolation to his mother, which later influenced the *Sayings of the Philosophers*, was already known from two Arabic MSS: Spitaler (1956) 495.

[43] Doufikar-Aerts (2000b).

(iv). Mubashshir ibn Fatik. The fullest piece of evidence for an Arabic translation of the Pseudo-Callisthenes, though it is indirect evidence only, is the existence of *the Ahbar al-Iskandar* of Mubassir ibn Fatik (ca. 1020-1100).[44] This is a brief summary (the German translation is less than 17 pages long) of the story as recounted by Pseudo-Callisthenes, but also incorporating other details, such as the tribute of golden eggs (Syriac and Persian), Alexander's monotheism (first in the gamma-recension), his visit to the king of China (Syriac), a reference to the Turks, the story of the man who found a treasure in a house he had bought (Jewish), a variant version of the Brahmans story, concerning people who have graves in their house-courtyards, as well as the usual Brahman story, the prophecy that Alexander will lie after death between an iron earth and a golden sky (from Eutychius), and the sayings of the philosophers at his death (Syriac, but also immensely popular in the Arabic tradition and already familiar in the work of Hunayn ibn Ishaq (809-873): see below). As Van Leeuwen has remarked, it is because of Mubassir's narrative that we assume there must have been an Arabic translation of Pseudo-Callisthenes: how otherwise did Mubassir obtain these narrative details? The most recent survey of Arabic Alexander Romances (Samir 1998) ends in a similar aporia as to the existence of an Arabic version of Pseudo-Callisthenes.[45]

(v). Another small piece of evidence for a possible Arabic translation of the Romance is as follows. P. Bulgakov has published a passage of a Meshed MS of Ibn al-Faqih, which is a list of Alexander's city-foundations.[46] It seems to be translated from the Syriac. Its existence implies the existence of a full Arabic translation from which this is excerpted by Ibn al-Faqih.

The cumulative effect of so many portions of the story in Arabic is to suggest that a full translation may indeed have existed, and we may

[44] Meissner (1895).

[45] Cf. Macuch (1989) 5 note: "A rediscovery of an Arabic MS containing a full version of the Egyptian beginning of the story … still escapes the efforts of scholars and remains a *pium desiderium*."

[46] Bulgakov (1965). Thanks to Rossitza Atanassova for summarising for me the contents of this article, which is in Russian.

hope that one day a MS will be uncovered in some undisturbed collection.[47]

Alexander in Arabic Wisdom Literature

The second main strand of Arabic writing about Alexander covers his role in the wisdom tradition.[48] In the wisdom tradition Alexander appears as a scholar and a lover of music.[49] He is said by the tenth-century scholar Ibn al-Nadim to have been the first to enjoy recitations of tales at evening (tales of the kind of which he became the protagonist!).[50] But he also appears very often in collections of proverbs and of wise sayings, both as speaker and as subject; as a correspondent (generally with Aristotle) on matters of politics, science and philosophy; as a patron of philosophers and sages (a motley band who frequently include Plato, Thales, Diogenes and Apollonius of Tyana) and as an author or instigator of scientific-philosophical works (in the broadest sense).[51] In many cases we know little of these works beyond their titles. Ibn al-Nadim refers to a work known as *The Drawing of Lots by Dhu'l-qarnain* which seems to have been a work on divination;[52] to a second such work on divination by arrows, and to an epistle, *The gift of Alexander*, which may be a gift from Aristotle to Alexander.

Another text of this tradition is the *Thesaurus Alexandri* 'translated from the Greek and Roman' on the order of the Caliph al-

[47] Later historians of the ninth and tenth centuries, Dinawari and Tabari, give brief accounts of the career of Alexander, but these are largely confined to his dealings with Persia, and follow the Persian tradition which is known from Firdausi. They must have been following a Persian source, and their accounts are not particularly close to the Greek. The *Nihayat u'l-Irab fi akhbari'l Furs wa'l-Arab* covers much of the same ground as Dinawari, often more fully: Browne (1900). Tha'alabi is a different matter, for his account of Alexander includes the story of the Land of Darkness and the Water of Life, with the stratagem of the foals, the journey with Khidr and the interview with the angel, apparently drawn from the version of 'Umara. He also incorporates the hostile Persian tradition that Alexander destroyed the sacred books of the Persians. I am grateful to Julia Ashtiany Bray for letting me see an unpublished translation of this portion of Tha'alabi's *Tales of the Prophets*.

[48] Gutas (1975).

[49] Rosenthal (1975) 38, 226.

[50] See Dodge (1970).

[51] A good example is an astrology text attributed to him: Young, Latham and Serjeant (1990) 292.

[52] Dodge (1970) 737, 853.

Mu'tasim (833-842),[53] which was a work on elixirs and amulets. It was supposed to have been composed by Hermes and to have incorporated a prologue and epilogue by Aristotle addressed to Alexander. Alexander also appears in many of the stories told in the Pseudo-Aristotelian *De Lapidibus*, preserved in an Arabic MS of 1329 CE, but already known in Latin I 1187, and in a Hebrew version.[54] Yet another text of this kind is the late tenth century *Liber Alkhandrei* from Muslim Spain, a work on mathematics billed as the work "Alexandri summi astrologi."[55]

Consideration of such wisdom texts and collections of proverbs is inextricably bound up with the position of Aristotle, and Alexander as his addressee, in Arabic literature.[56] The works are "Mirrors for Princes," like their later development in the Persian author Nizami.[57] All these texts raise the question of their Greek source, if any. Frequently such texts claim to be the work of a translator from Greek or Syriac, but it may often be the case that they are not so much translated as compiled, or put together by free association from remembered scraps of Greek learning. In this they differ from the very substantial corpus of Greek philosophy and science translated into Arabic in the ninth century.[58] The doyen of all these translators was Hunayn ibn Ishaq (809-873).[59] He and his school of disciples at the institute of translation founded by the Caliph al-Mutawakkil translated nearly all the works of Aristotle, including some spurious works, a good deal of Galen (129 works are listed), and works by Plato, Alexander of Aphrodisias, Themistius, Proclus, Euclid, Archimedes, Hippocrates, Ptolemy, and others. At the same time the Arab prince al-Kindi employed translators to translate other Greek works, which he used as a basis for his own original philosophical studies. The translating activity continued vigorously during the tenth century, still

[53] Foerster (1888) 22.
[54] Ruska (1911).
[55] Burnett (1986).
[56] Peters (1968); O'Leary (1949).
[57] See Brocker (1966) 90 f. and notes 260-1.
[58] Goodman (1990); Gutas (1998).
[59] On Hunayn: Goodman (1990); Wright (1894) 211-13; Duval (1899) 276-7; Brock (1991) 139-62; Strohmaier (1991); Bergsträsser (1913) 60. A similar collection is the Syriac one made by Gregory bar-Hebraeus (1226-1286), which is too late to be evidence for any process of transmission from Greek, but useful as an example of the genre in Syriac. It includes pithy and profitable sayings by thinkers including Socrates, Aristotle, Alexander, Plato and Diogenes.

with a very heavy emphasis on philosophical and medical works. These interests are those reflected in works we are about to consider, though it is interesting that those scientific works associated with the name of Alexander seem quite often to be of a pseudo-scientific nature (elixirs and amulets; astrology; stone-lore; though it should be remembered that the distinction of scientific and pseudo-scientific is ours and not a contemporary one). It is equally interesting that the works associated with the name of Alexander are works of which the Greek original is not to be found, i.e. it is lost or it never existed: both conclusions may be entertained.

The two main works in question are the *Sayings of the Philosophers* and the *Secret of Secrets*. There is a considerable bibliography on both works, and full discussion is impossible in the confines of this paper.[60] Suffice it to say that both seem to be centos of wise sayings, some from the Greek tradition, others new. Most significantly for the concerns of this paper, Grignaschi has argued that the *Secret of Secrets* was once part of a sixteen-part epistolary novel about Alexander, translated from the Greek. The Greek original is, Grignaschi maintains, a late antique romance following a tradition entirely separate from that of Pseudo-Callisthenes, and which has left no trace in classical sources.

Startling as such a conclusion may be, Grignaschi's case, if it becomes accepted, would make Alexander already in Greek writings what he certainly is in Arabic sources, a vehicle for the exposition of detailed philosophical and political advice through his tutor Aristotle. Grignaschi's hypothesis is accepted as a possibility by Manzaloui.[61] He draws attention to some other similar pseudo-Aristotelian texts in Arabic, namely three works assembled by Miskawayh (c. 10-11) which consist of dialogues of Aristotle and Alexander, to which is appended a collection of aphorisms of Socrates. These works concentrate on problems of kingly rule such as the selection of advisers. They reflect contemporary issues rather than anything known to have interested Aristotle. In content they resemble the Persian *Qabus*-

---

[60] On the *Sayings of the Philosophers*: Brock (1970); Goodman (1990) 482-3; Strohmaier (1991) 163-70, 167 and 387-90. On its reworking by Hunayn ibn Ishaq (809-873 CE): Sturm (1970). On the reappearance of the latter work in Mubashshir: Meissner (1895); Buehler (1941); Kazis (1962). Knust (1879) gives texts of both works in Spanish. See Badawi (1958) 243-51. On the *Secret of Secrets*: Goodman (1990) 483.

[61] Manzalaoui (1974); Metlitzki (1977) 95-116.

nama of the late eleventh century. Though Manzaloui suggests that these works, like the *Secret of Secrets*, are based on a series of Hellenistic opuscula welded into a whole, the case cannot be regarded as a strong one.

Grignaschi's hypothesis requires testing by scholars competent to examine the Arabic text, or the publication of a translation of the whole work which can be examined by classical scholars. The difficulty is to establish a context for such a writing in Greek. Philosophical discussions of Alexander in classical antiquity differ entirely from what appears in this work. The *Secret of Secrets* does not adhere to the Cynic or Stoic complexes of *exempla*; it shows no Christian elements; and I think it remains more likely that this is a work of Arabic origin, inspired by the needs of the ʻAbbasid court for intelligent writing on statecraft, which drew on classical materials, perhaps even anthologising and excerpting Greek writings, but forming them into something with a radically new perspective.

Conclusion

It is time to pull together some of the threads of this complicated exposition, and to try to summarise the main meanings of Alexander for the early Arabs. As in the bulk of the paper, I shall reflect as far as possible on his reception up to the eighth or ninth century of our era, and omit consideration of later writers such as Mas'udi and Qazvini. In doing so I may draw attention to three strikingly complementary interpretative essays by Mario Grignaschi, whose work I have already referred to;[62] by Francois de Polignac;[63] and by Earle H. Waugh.[64] But to begin with let me draw your attention to the first critical comment on the Alexander story in Islam, by the great Muslim scholar Ibn Khaldun (1333-78).

For Ibn Khaldun, the importance of Alexander is as a source of intellectual knowledge and wisdom.

> The intellectual sciences are said to have come to the Greeks from the Persians, (at the time) when Alexander killed Darius and gained con-

[62] Grignaschi (1993).
[63] de Polignac (1982).
[64] Waugh (1996).

> trol of the Achaemenid empire. At that time, he appropriated the books and sciences of the Persians.

Later, he tells us, when the Muslims conquered Persia, they destroyed all the Persian books. Thus, the inference follows, when the Arabs found that they needed this wisdom, they had to recover it from the Greek books.[65] Dimitri Gutas shows that this recovery of Greek science was part of the Umayyad attempt to represent themselves as the successors of the Sassanian kings. In this complex of ideas, Aristotle is at least as important a figure as Alexander, for it is he who is the source of the wisdom of which Alexander is more often a recipient than an exponent. That is indeed the role, which Alexander most often plays in the works I have discussed.

The wisdom element is important, but not the sole aspect of Arab interest in Alexander. A second strand is represented by his appearance in the Qur'an as builder of the wall against Gog and Magog. Polignac has developed this aspect of Alexander by drawing attention to his role in Mas'udi as a builder of cities. He is supposed to have built Hamadan, and to have provided it, for protection, with the large stone lion that is still to be seen there. Even more importantly (and in this case correctly), he is known as the builder of Alexandria. His role here is again as a bringer and defender of order. His descent in the diving bell is located in the harbour of Alexandria, and its purpose is not, as in the Greek Romance (recensions beta and later), to explore the Ocean and discover its mysteries, but to discover its dangers and to protect the city from them. Polignac sees Alexander as an emblematic ruler. City building is a form of cosmological activity and his role as founder and defender is an aspect of his status as *kosmokrator*, a universal ruler.

Earle H. Waugh also concentrates on Alexander as a royal figure. He emphasises Alexander's connections to God in the long romances, the extent of his rule and his travels; but also his role as an emblem of mortality and mutability. His visit to the tomb of Shaddad son of Ad, and his experiences at the City of Brass, both make him an emblem of the truth that death comes even to the mighty – an aspect of the common Arab topos, 'Where are the great men of old.' Waugh also draws attention to the Letter Cycle as one element of the process of making Alexander an exemplary king. He argues that the

[65] Ibn Khaldun 3.113-14. Cf. Gutas (1998) 40, 43 f.

Umayyad rulers needed to make their kingship as awe-inspiring and numinous as the Byzantine emperor they had displaced. However, the elements of ceremonial he draws attention to are derived directly from Byzantine court practice and do not have anything integrally to do with Alexander.

Nonetheless, Waugh does point the way towards an aspect of Arab treatment of Alexander, which is emphasised by Grignaschi in his interpretative article, the 'sanctification' of Alexander. For him, the story of Alexander's commitment to monotheism is particularly important. This occurs in the gamma-recension of the Greek Romance, and is important not only in later authors like Nizami, but throughout the two long Arabic romances. Alexander receives tasks from angels; his commission is to convert the world to Islam and to preach the *tawhid* (the doctrine of One God). It is undoubtedly the case that in these long works Alexander functions as a prophet of God. His roles as a great conqueror, as a philosopher, as a builder and a ruler, are all subsumed in this religious mission, and his great achievement is indissolubly related to his understanding of, his submission to, the dictates of God and the angels – his recognition that he cannot achieve eternal life.

In this there is a remarkable parallel to the development Alexander undergoes in Western medieval literature. As in the Arabic tradition, the western writers (apart from the translators) are very selective in their interest in his story. The writers of Universal Chronicles, Peter Comestor, Vincent of Beauvais and Ranulph Higden, and their successors, concentrate (like the Arabs) on Alexander as builder of the wall against Gog and Magog, and his function as harbinger of the end of time. Furthermore, the whole of the Alexander Romance is inserted in the German and Dutch History Bibles between the end of the Old Testament and the Book of Maccabees, to fill out the record of sacred history. Alexander thus becomes an ideal king, an embodiment of virtue and religious duty, and also an emblem of Everyman (for he too must die).[66] The *Gesta Romanorum* contains a story in which Alexander lights a candle in his hall and summons all his people to repent before the expiration of the candle. The moral is given:

[66] Stoneman (1999).

"My beloved, Alexander is Christ, the burning candle is the life present, and the heralds are the preachers."[67]

Islamic literature can offer a full parallel to this in a story where Alexander has turned into the Prophet Muhammad. A Maghrebi legend[68] tells of the Saharan town of Miqyarat, near the River of Sand. Hamdallah Mustawfi of Qazvin, a Persian author whose writings were based on Arabic sources, tells that this city, where Alexander had encountered the Brahmans, is inhabited by one of the Tribes of the Children of Israel. They are visited by the Prophet Muhammad, who asks them a series of questions exactly like those which Alexander asked of the Brahmans in the Alexander Romance. Elsewhere in Arabic literature this legend is told of Alexander, and there are also Jewish versions.[69] The story is plainly derived from a Jewish intermediary and not from Greek, but there is no doubt that it is the Alexander figure who has become transformed into the Prophet. There could be no more substantial tribute to the acceptability of Alexander, and his meaning, in the Islamic world. King and Prophet have become as one.

[67] *Gesta Romanorum* xcvi p. 168 f.

[68] Norris (1972) 99-102.

[69] In Arabic geographical literature: Doufikar-Aerts *per litt.* Jewish wisdom was sometimes believed to be related to the Brahman tradition, for example in Clearchus of Soli fr. 6 = Jos. *CAp* I.22: cf. Stoneman (1994a). Knights (1993 and 1995) is a study of a Jewish text, 'The History of the Rechabites' which derives directly from the Brahman encounter in the Alexander legends.

This page intentionally left blank

'THE LAST DAYS OF ALEXANDER' IN AN ARABIC POPULAR ROMANCE OF AL-ISKANDAR

Faustina Doufikar-Aerts

The Alexander Romance of Pseudo-Callisthenes spread, through numerous translations and derivatives, not only in the medieval western and Byzantine world, but also in the East. The oriental tradition is represented by the extant Syriac, Persian and Ethiopic versions of the Alexander romance. They derive from the Greek δ-recension of Pseudo-Callisthenes, which also underlies the Latin version, known as *Historia de Preliis*. This δ-recension, which is related to the α-recension, did not survive in Greek.[1]

It is believed that a Pahlavi (Middle Persian) and an Arabic translation played an intermediary role in the oriental tradition. According to this theory a Middle Persian translation should have preceded the Syriac version of the romance. This Pahlavi text did not survive. The Arabic translation in its turn, which is supposed to intermediate between the Syriac and Ethiopic versions of the romance, is considered lost as well. Only secondary indications point to its former existence. There are surviving abstracts and summaries of the story in Arabic,[2] transmitted mainly by historians and compilers of Wisdom literature.[3] Only a few of these remnants have been published during the past centuries.[4] Apart from this, the Persian and Ethiopic versions, which are obviously derivatives through an Arabic intermediary, may be considered a strong clue. A complete Arabic version has not yet come to light.

In view of this situation I tried to verify a remark in the famous work of G. Cary, *The Medieval Alexander*, concerning "an Arabic manuscript discovered in Constantinople, which might prove to be the lost intermediary."[5] After a first reading of this alleged Arabic

---

[1] For a survey of the complicated history of the transmission of the Pseudo-Callisthenes see Van Thiel (1983) xi-xlviii, and Stoneman (1996) 601-12. See also below, note 11.

[2] See Nöldeke (1890) 34-49.

[3] See Meissner (1895).

[4] Among them a short Spanish-Arabic Alexander Romance. See Garcia Gomez (1929).

[5] Cary (1967) 12 note 19.

translation of Pseudo-Callisthenes it became clear to me that the manuscript was not the sought-after Arabic Alexander Romance. Instead it turned out that it contained 'A Life of Al-Iskandar,' entitled *Sîrat Al-Iskandar*, which is ascribed to Ibrâhîm ibn Mufarrij al-Ş ûrî, presumably a citizen of Tyre. It is an Arabic romance, composed in a narrative style quite common for Arabic popular epics, the so-called *sîra*'s.[6] Though the archetype of this popular romance of Alexander can probably not be dated before the 13th century and its narrative style may differ substantially from the traditional Alexander romances, it still contains many legendary motifs, known from Pseudo-Callisthenes and other Hellenistic sources. In spite of this the tradition of the Arabic popular romances of Alexander has been neglected almost completely in the past. None of the manuscripts of the *Sîrat Al-Iskandar* has ever been published.[7]

As part of my research I collated this Aya Sofya manuscript with other manuscripts of this kind, preserved in the collections of several European libraries. My reward for making my way through thousands of manuscript pages was that I made some discoveries which may prove to be of some interest. I hit upon an episode of the 'Last Days of Alexander,' which is otherwise unknown in the Islamic-Arabic Alexander tradition. The Arabic romance tradition in general avoids mentioning the legendary version of Alexander's death, according to which he was poisoned.[8] According to most authors, he died of natural causes. They dwell on the lamentations and wise sayings uttered by the philosophers surrounding his coffin. Also the 'Letters of Consolation,' written by Alexander to his mother, are characteristic of this tradition. The varieties of the 'Last Days' episode in medieval European vernaculars were studied by an interdisciplinary group of scholars at the University of Groningen some twenty-five years ago. The joint investigations resulted in the edition of *Ten Studies on the Last Days of Alexander in Literary and Historical Writing*, which treats medieval English, German, Dutch, French, Romanian, Latin, Byzantine and Spanish versions of the episode of the Last Days, as well as an approach of classical historians.

---

[6] For general remarks about the semi-oral *sîra*-genre see Lyons (1995).

[7] I am currently preparing an edition of the first part of the *Sîrat Al-Iskandar*.

[8] Scarce mention is made of it in some works of Wisdom literature and in the chronicle of Eutychius († 940).

This volume was indispensable as a work of reference for the traits of the Last Days in general and especially in relation to this study.[9]

As to the Arabic episode of the Last Days, it is extant in at least five manuscripts of the *Sîrat Al-Iskandar*.[10] The excerpt was apparently interpolated near the end of this romance. According to the novelist or for that matter the composer of the text, the part was added to the story for the sake of completeness, and it was presented as a second reading. He explicitly states that the account derives from a Syriac original. In general, such a remark should be viewed with due suspicion, especially within the context of popular romances. Claims of famous authorship, reliable sources and appealing provenance are very common in this genre, and the narrators prefer to refer to celebrities of the past.

With all due reservations, I examined the interpolation of the Arabic Last Days and compared the contents with the apposite recensions and translations of the Last Days in Pseudo-Callisthenes.[11] The outcome pointed inevitably in one direction: the correspondence with the Last Days in the Syriac Pseudo-Callisthenes was quite compelling. In this respect it was rather puzzling to observe that it even surpassed the degree of likeness with the Ethiopic romance, which is supposed to have been translated from an intermediate Arabic version.

Before going into this discrepancy, I will substantiate my assertions with regard to the similarity between the Syriac romance and the Arabic excerpts with some instances. For the Syriac text I depend on the English translation of the Syriac romance by E.A. Wallis Budge.[12]

---

[9] Aerts, Hermans, Visser (1978).

[10] Berlin, WE 531, ff. 52v-56v (dated 1757) in Ahlwardt (1896); Paris 3682, ff. 354v-360v (dated 1594), 3683, ff. 355v-359 (dated 1643), and 3684, ff. 392r-395v (dated 16th century) in Mac-Guckin de Slane (1883-95), and London Add. 7368, ff. 288r-290r (dated 1782) in Rieu (1894).

[11] The Greek redactions α, β/λ, γ/ε, the Latin and Hebrew *Historia de Preliis*, Armenian, Syriac and Ethiopic. References made in this paper apply to one of the following editions/translations: Pfister (1978) 71-81 (A), Van Thiel (1983) 152-67 (L), Müller (1846) 143-52 (α, β, γ), Stoneman (1991) 145-59 (L, γ), Trumpf (1974) 166-78 (ε), Kirsch (1984) 115-40 (*HdP* $I^{1,2,3}$ Lat), Van Bekkum (1994) 137-57 (*HdP* I^2 Hebr), Wolohoijan (1969) 145-59 (Arm), Wallis Budge (1889) 131-43 (Syr), and Wallis Budge (1896) 333-53 (Eth). See also Dowden (1989) 650-735.

[12] For specific cases I consulted G.J. Reinink, Syrianist at Groningen University, to whom I am grateful for his valuable suggestions and kind cooperation.

The chapter of the Last Days in Arabic contains roughly the following episodes:

1. The Letter of Alexander to his mother about his travels in India.
2. The birth of a partly living, partly dead *monstrum*.
3. The poisoning of Alexander.
4. Alexander's Last Will.
5. Lamentations and Wise Sayings at Alexander's tomb.
6. Funeral in Alexandria and Epilogue.

The first episode, the letter about the *mirabilia* in India, is very close to the Syriac version, from its introductory sentences and further in the subsequent events. Many distinguishing features such as measures, weights, distances, and times are mostly identical. It is quite remarkable that some characteristics, belonging to a pre-Islamic 'pagan' entourage, have survived in the text; this is quite exceptional for Arabic documents of this kind. For example, Alexander orders an offering of sacrificial animals at the temple of Hercules. In the Arabic letter the name of the deity has been replaced by the current term for God, *Allâh*, to be sure, but the sacrificial animals escaped the retouch. The same heathen ritual takes place in the City of the Sun, the name of which was translated literally: *Madînat as-Shams*.

Another passage in the account of the palace of Shoshan or Sûs gives a description of the large silver jars, which were alleged to have a capacity of three hundred and sixty measures of wine. Alexander puts this assertion to the test, having one of the jars filled with wine and poured out for his soldiers during a banquet. This exact specification has been maintained, heedless of the Islamic ban on the use of wine. Moreover, it is stated that these jars had been brought to the palace from *Madînat al-Mushtarî*, which means, the city of Zeus. It is very unlikely that the composer associated this name with the name of a deity from antiquity. In Arabic the name was only in use as an astronomical term. These unretouched borrowings are highly significant in this text, because the Arabic Alexander figure is portrayed as a propagator of (Islamic) monotheism, and pre-eminently in the *Sîrat Al-Iskandar*.

The dependence of the Arabic excerpt on the Syriac text may be demonstrated most convincingly by means of features which occur exclusively in the Syriac romance. By way of contrast the Ethiopic version will be given in some cases as well.

First of all the description of the Pillars of Hercules is very distinct in the Syriac romance and the Arabic corresponds with it quite closely. In both texts the pillars have been replaced by statues, twelve cubits in height and two cubits in breadth. The shavings from boring the golden statue weigh 1300 *mithqâls*. In the Greek text the hole is filled with 1500 gold pieces. The Ethiopic text has a completely different reading: Alexander found on site twenty thousand and five hundred golden crowns, which he took with him.

Another example is found in the next passage about the river Thermodon. After his return from a dark area, Alexander arrives in a very *warm* region, a detail that is known only from the Syriac version. The ‘warm region’ can be taken as a mistranslation of the river’s name in the Greek text: ὁ ποταμὸς Θερμώδων. The name of the river is missing in the Syriac and Arabic versions, probably because it had been interpreted as being the adjective θερμός, warm. The Ethiopic romance and the other recensions do not mention the warm region, and the river in the Ethiopic text is called Barmûs.

Further, in the Syriac and Arabic versions the women resembling the Amazons wear black clothes. In the Greek romance they are dressed in flowery garments: ἄνθιναι ἐσθῆτες. In the Ethiopic romance they have dyed garments. The women cross the river *by night* and they turn out to pay no tribute to Alexander, details that appear in this way solely in the Syriac and Arabic versions.

In the Syriac and Arabic recensions the Red Sea is called the great sea, where a hunt takes place. This event is absent in all the other recensions. In the next episode most of the romances mention Alexander’s encounter with strange people, among them dog-headed men and headless people who have their eyes and mouths in their chests. The Syriac and Arabic texts make no mention of these creatures. Instead they relate that “thenceforward there was no land.” From there Alexander and his men embark in five ships and on the third day they arrive in the city of the Sun, according to the Syriac and the Arabic text. In other recensions there are no ships and the distance is specified in other terms.

As to the palaces of Xerxes and Cyrus, in the Syriac Pseudo-Callisthenes these are described as “the palace of Khosrau and king Pâqôr.” This has been rendered into Arabic as “the palace of Kûrush and Nûr, the two kings.” According to a remark of the editor E.A. Wallis Budge, the name Pâqôr should be read as *qôr*, which is a cor-

ruption of Κῦρος. A simple *lapsus calami* of this word *qôr* results in *nûr*, be it in Syriac or in Arabic. In Ethiopic this sentence has been translated as “the *kingdom* of Xerxes and Cyrus.” This may be caused by a confusion of the Greek terms τὰ βασίλεια (palaces) and ἡ βασιλεία (kingdom). It could indicate that Ethiopic was not translated from Syriac here, but from a Greek original.

The Syriac and Arabic texts also differ from other recensions on the point of a statue in this palace. In the Syriac romance it is said that “a statue of one of the gods of the Greeks stood there, and they say that at the time that king Xerxes was alive, when any of his enemies were preparing to come to his land with war and battle, a voice issued from this statue” (133). In the Arabic text we read here: “in another room was a statue and they claim that some Greek had erected it for Kûrush. When an enemy approached [their country] the statue would let him know, it would advise the king how to deal with him [the enemy], how to outwit him and dislodge him from the country.” There is no equivalent for this statue in other recensions.

Yet another example is found in the description of a large cup in this same palace. The Arabic differs from the Syriac sentence by a single word. In Syriac we read: “And I found a very large cup, and upon it was carved [a representation of] the battle, which king Xerxes fought *in ships* with the Greeks.” It has been rendered into Arabic as follows: “And I found there also a large golden cup, and upon it was carved [a representation of] the battle of king Kûrush with the Greeks *in the years*.” This last part is not quite comprehensible, either semantically or syntactically.[13] It seems that the Arabic word for ‘years,’ *sanîn*, is a corruption of the word for ‘ships,’ *safîn*. If this is the case, the phrase would have run originally: “the battle of king Kûrush with the Greeks *in ships*,” exactly as in Syriac. Besides, the other recensions do not mention the cup, but a house adorned with this sea-battle scene, sufficiently termed in Greek ἡ ναυμαχία.[14] The Syriac translator apparently needed to give a paraphrase of this Greek term, in which he used the word ‘ships.’ This explains why the ships occur only in Syriac and it proves that the error in Arabic could not possibly have arisen except on the basis of a translation from Syriac. The Ethiopic text omits the entire passage.

---

[13] In two of the later manuscripts this sentence has been adjusted by adding the word *mutaqaddima*, which changes it to mean “in the bygone years.”

[14] Only in Van Thiel (1983) 156.

To further demonstrate this point the examples must be limited to a selection from the remaining sections.[15]

Also in the second part of the Last Days chapter, the Arabic version agrees with the Syriac fairly well. A woman gives birth to an infant, “from his buttocks upwards it had the form of a man, and from his buttocks downwards he had a number of forms of animals, a lion, a leopard, a wolf and a wild dog” (134). The human part was dead, while the animal limbs were alive. The mother asks permission to speak to Alexander in private to show him her ‘prodigy.’ In the Arabic text the animals mentioned are the bull, the horse, the leopard, and the dog. They are listed in the singular, as in the Syriac text, unlike the other recensions, where plural forms are used. In the Ethiopic romance this part of the Last Days has not been transmitted.

Next, we will examine the section of Alexander’s poisoning. According to the Syriac text Antipater sends a present to the king, which the latter accepts, but “although he took the gold, he did not set right his mind with Antipater” (135). In Arabic we read here: “He accepted this from him, showing him delight and contentment, but inside he was furious at him.” In other recensions no mention is made of any gifts.

Subsequently we can read in the poisoning scene as follows. “When Alexander had drunk” the poisoned wine “he straightway felt great pain.” In both accounts, Syriac and Arabic, he immediately commands some of that wine to be poured to the others attending the gathering, apparently in order to see if this wine produces an effect on them. None of the other recensions includes this experiment. Instead, Alexander bids his companions to continue, apparently because he does not want to spoil the party.

Subsequently, Alexander falls ill. His soldiers demand to see him, so he is brought to the hippodrome. The Arabic *maydân* is an exact translation of this term. In other recensions Alexander is brought to the courtyard or central hall of the palace. Then a man, called Pînâqlêôs in Syriac and described as “an old Macedonian warrior and hero,” raises his voice saying: “O king, doer of good things, Philip thy father ruled over us kindly and firmly, and thou too, O king, hast been likewise good and merciful and kind to us” (139). In the Arabic

[15] Some other instances can be found in my earlier article on the Arabic ‘Last Days.’ See Doufikar-Aerts (1999).

report the man is depicted as a *shaykh* (an old man), courageous and strong, who says: "*Yâ fâ'il al-khayrât.*" These are the very same words as "O doer of good things." He continues with "your father Fîlîfûs ruled over us with wisdom and compassion. You are his heir and his kingdom devolved upon you, and you have not ceased to be merciful, kind and good to us." Then the soldiers pull their swords to kill themselves. They prefer to die rather than to outlive their king. Alexander dissuades them from this act of despair, objecting: "O my servants and friends and fellow-soldiers, why do ye add pain to pain so that I should taste death by dying before my own death?" according to the Syriac text (139). The correspondence with the Arabic version goes so far that even this extraordinary expression has been retained: "O my companions and dear friends and compatriots, do not add grief to my grief and pain to my pain by letting me die a death of grievance and agony, taking your own lives." The similarity is the more significant, because this answer of Alexander does not form part of any of the other texts. In the other recensions he is not able to speak any more and he only raises his hand.

The next episode of this chapter to be examined is the letter containing Alexander's last will. Of this testament there remains only the beginning, a few lines with consolatory words to his mother. She is called Almûfîd, which is probably a corruption of the name Olympias. Arabic historians name her Alumfîdâ or Almûfîdâ. In the popular romances this name is unknown; she is called here Rûqîyâ, Arqîyâ or Nâhîd, which is also the case in the preceding part of the *Sîrat Al-Iskandar*, to which this episode is appended. The rest of the testament is lacking.

The fifth part of the chapter occurs exclusively in the Arabic text. It concerns the lamentations and wise sayings spoken over Alexander at his bier. This feature is characteristic of the Arabic tradition. It also became part of later versions of the romance, such as the *Historia de Preliis* I^3 and other European traditions, through Spain. For instance, the Last Days episode in the Castilian *General Estoria* IV inserted the Wise Sayings from Arabic sources.[16] It also became famous in the Persian tradition.[17] But it did not form part of the Syriac text.

---

[16] Jonxis-Henkemans (1978) 150, 152.

[17] In the epics of Firdawî and Nizamî, see Mohl (1876) 5, 257-65 and Bürgel (1991) 568-78.

Finally, there is the section on Alexander’s burial in Alexandria and the list of cities he built. The Arabic version corresponds with the Syriac text in giving the number of thirteen cities named Alexandria. The Syriac list of names seems to underlie the Arabic recital. For example, in the Syriac text we read: “The first is Alexandria which was built after the name of the horse called Bucephalus, the interpretation of which is Bull-head” (142). In Arabic we find here: “The first one he built is the city, named after his horse, which is called *Two-head*,[18] and also *Bull-head*.” Two of the manuscripts give for ‘Two-head’ instead *Ra's al-Ghûl*, which means ‘Cannibal-head.’ This probably refers to the reputation of the horse as a man-eater. Ten of the enumerated cities correspond to an equivalent in the Syriac text.[19]

So far this review has treated the story as regards the contents and the correspondence with the Syriac romance, which shows that the Last Days under discussion is closely related to the Syriac recension of Pseudo-Callisthenes. On some points it presents an almost literal translation, in other cases it is rather a paraphrase.

Having established this we can transfer our attention to a few differences that characterize the Arabic version as well.

First of all there are several omissions in the text. Some of these may have been made deliberately. Hardly any of the proper names in the romance has been transmitted. This is unfortunately a common practice in the Arabic Alexander tradition as a whole. Even if a certain name is given, it is often completely corrupt. In many cases a person can only be identified through the context. It is almost impossible to apply the opposite method. The testament, which contains quite a few proper names, has been omitted altogether in the Arabic text. Perhaps the contents and these meaningless names were deemed to be of no interest to the Arabic reader. This is also the case with the list of companions attending the banquet during which Alexander was poisoned. All the names are absent. Consequently no reference is made to the companions who shared in the conspiracy to poison Alexander. The Ethiopic romance gives the conspirators’ names, but they have been changed *vis-à-vis* the persons in the Greek romance.

---

[18] In Arabic the name is *Dhû ’r-Ra'sayn*, ‘with two heads.’ This is the name of Alexander’s horse in the *Sîrat Al-Iskandar*. This name apparently originated from association with the epithet of the Arabic Alexander, *Dhû ’l-Qarnayn*, ‘the Two-horned.’ These two names display a perfect assonance. See also Doufikar-Aerts (2003), chapter 4.

[19] See Doufikar-Aerts (1999) 68.

Other changes in the Arabic account must have been dictated by cultural or religious objections and preferences. An example is the scene of Alexander consulting his augurs about the portent of the birth of the Scylla-like baby. In the Syriac romance he threatens to cut off their heads if they do not speak the truth about the sign. In Arabic, however, Alexander promises immunity from punishment, while insisting on the truth.

Obviously unfit to be related to Arab readers is the next passage. Alexander is in grief about the ominous predictions and realizing that he will die soon, he calls himself “the third dead.” By doing so, according to the Syriac text, he ranks himself with Dionysus and Hercules among the gods. In Arabic this speech has not been transmitted. It was replaced by words of comfort spoken by Alexander’s friends. Another passage, containing the advice of the Chaldean sign-readers to burn the *monstrum*, has also been left out.

No doubt these retouches reflect the influence of the generous, pious and monotheistic image of Alexander in the Islamic cultural area. The omission of the motif of Alexander’s suicidal plan to throw himself into the river Euphrates also fits into this pattern.

As we mentioned before, the testament is almost completely absent from the Arabic text, except for a few introductory lines. These sentences consist of Alexander’s consolations for his mother. The rest of the testament appears to have been replaced by a suitable substitute. The consolatory part of Alexander’s testamentary letter has been extended. This extension prefaces other additions. One example is the reaction of Alexander’s mother to the letter: she endorses her son’s consolatory words, saying: “You are right, my son, fresh twigs will simply dry out and leaves will become scattered. The brilliant moon, my son, will turn gloomy by a lunar eclipse, etc.” These exclamations are followed by a mixture of lamentations and wise sayings spoken by herself, other women, Darius’ daughter, and several men. No names of philosophers are mentioned, otherwise than in some other collections of Wise Sayings.[20] This complex of elegiac speeches is apparently related to certain chapters in the *liber philosophorum* of Hunayn ibn Ishâq (873), *Nawâdir al-Falâsifa*.[21] The work was well known in the Middle Ages by its Spanish title *Los Buenos*

[20] See, for instance, Cheikho (1906) 1, 83.
[21] In the edition of Badawi (1985) the work is entitled *Adâb al-Falâsifa*. In the chapters of the *Nawâdir* no names of philosophers are mentioned either.

Proverbios. It can be observed that several small parts in Hunayn’s text have been integrally reproduced in the Arabic version of the Last Days. The pieces have been put together in the same order as they were found in the ‘original’ text. This is the typical way that Arab composers excerpted the works of the ancient classics. Except for two or three sentences, the complete substitution in the Arabic Last Days can be traced to the chapters involved in the *Nawâdir al-Falâsifa.*[22]

The purpose of pointing to these deviations, and not only to the similarities, is to give a correct impression of the text. It is clear that the Arabic Last Days has its own individual character and it can be valued on its own merits.

This statement leaves us with some questions to be answered. What does the discovery of the Arabic Last Days mean in terms of unravelling the transmission? Does it confirm the theory about an intermediate Arabic translation between the Syriac and the Ethiopic romance? Is this episode of the Last Days to be considered a part of the lost Arabic (integral?) translation? Why does the Arabic text differ to a larger extent from the Ethiopic version than it does from the Syriac text?

With regard to the transmission, the appearance of this Arabic recension demands a readjustment of the current theory. It has become clear that the Arabic episode of the Last Days is based on the Syriac recension. This Arabic translation, however, can hardly be considered the original of the Last Days episode in the Ethiopic romance. The answer to this problem may be fairly simple. The theory according to which the Ethiopic version depends on the Syriac romance through an intermediate Arabic version is actually a simplified representation of the facts. Only the central part of the Ethiopic romance originated from the Syriac Pseudo-Callisthenes. The entire Ethiopic Last Days episode should go back to the early Greek α-recension, according to the theories of German scholar Karl Friedrich Weymann, also through an intermediate Arabic version.[23] This could elucidate the discrepancy between Ethiopic and Arabic, and it would confirm Weymann’s opinion. At the same time it urges one to conclude that

[22] Badawi (1985). The subsequent sentences can be found on pages 95-7, 100, 104 and 108.
[23] See Weymann (1901) 16.

more than one translation into Arabic must have been made: at least one from Syriac and another one directly from Greek.

On these grounds it seems plausible to assume that the Arabic Last Days episode under discussion formed part of the intermediate version that underlies the central part of the Ethiopic romance. (For some reason or another the translator did not render this sample of the Last Days into Ethiopic, but instead he took 'his' *Vorlage* from the α-recension.) Nevertheless, this idea must also be rejected, for the following reason. During my scrutiny of the manuscripts involved, I traced three other parts of the Pseudo-Callisthenes romance in Arabic. One of these presents the *Epistola Alexandri ad Aristotelem*,[24] the second is the *Letter of Aristotle to Alexander*, and the last one is the *Episode of the Amazons*.[25] All of these episodes appear to have belonged to the same translation of which the Last Days episode also formed a part. The problematical issue is that precisely these three episodes belong to the central part of the Ethiopic romance, which represents the Syriac romance, as Weymann correctly stated. Consequently these episodes should be considered the *Vorlage* of this central part of the Ethiopic romance. However, they correspond to a lesser extent with Ethiopic and they match on this point the similarity of the Last Days episode with the Syriac text. In fact the Ethiopic version cannot possibly be based on them.[26] Moreover, these four fragments, including the Last Days, are Islamic, unlike the Christianised Ethiopic text. These observations lead to the remarkable conclusion that a second translation from Syriac into Arabic must be taken into account apart from the one that actually underlies the central part of the Ethiopic romance.

To summarize: I developed the theory that the Syriac Pseudo-Callisthenes has been rendered into Arabic twice, probably during the ninth century. One of these was the prototype for the four fragments described, which are found today in the *Sîrat Al-Iskandar* manuscripts, including the Last Days. The other was a Christianised translation, which underlies the central part of the Ethiopic romance. A third Arabic translation was made directly from the Greek. It formed the basis for the Last Days episode in the Ethiopic romance.

[24] See Doufikar-Aerts (2000b).
[25] See Wallis Budge (1889) resp. 131 and 127-30.
[26] See Doufikar-Aerts (2000b) 50.

Possibly this was not a full-scale translation, but just this one episode, which has not survived.

With regard to the Christianised Arabic version, its existence and intermediate position is less hypothetical than we had to believe thus far. Recently, I have been able to trace “a manuscript, which will prove to be the lost intermediary,” this time the real thing. This manuscript contains a sample of the *Vorlage* of the Ethiopic translation.[27] It shows that the preliminary Arabic version had been Christianised before it was rendered into Ethiopic. It lacks, indeed, the episode of the Last Days as found in the *Sîra*-manuscripts. But neither does it contain the Last Days episode, based on the α-recension, which nowadays forms part of the Ethiopic romance.

In view of the above, it is exceedingly important for the study of the oriental tradition and the Alexander tradition as a whole that the manuscripts should become available in printed editions and translations.

At the beginning of this essay I drew attention to the volume of the *Ten Studies on the Last Days of Alexander in Literary and Historical Writing*. In the introduction to that volume it was noted that contributions from other disciplines, such as Arabic, were badly needed, but representatives could not be found.[28] It has become clear now that no text representing the Arabic branch was available at the time, because it had not yet been traced. With this paper I hope to have made a contribution with retrospective effect, and to have made up for the missing part of that volume. The Arabic Last Days not only broadens the spectrum of representations from antiquity to the late Middle Ages; it also constitutes a genuine Arabic version of this part of Pseudo-Callisthenes. A final demonstration of its distinctiveness is properly shown by one of its funeral sentences:

> This king of kings is in his Master’s hand,
> by tribulations troubled to his end.
> Let him be warned, whoever sees this sight
> and ponder his affairs, whoever gets this right.

---

[27] See Doufikar-Aerts (2003) chapter 1.
[28] Aerts, Hermans, Visser (1978) viii.

This page intentionally left blank

LUCIUS AND AESOP GAIN A VOICE: APULEIUS *MET.* 11.1-2 AND *VITA AESOPI* 7

Ellen Finkelpearl

In a relatively neglected chapter of his book, *Auctor and Actor*, Jack Winkler explores some of the connections that he finds in the sensibilities of the author of the anonymous *Life of Aesop* and Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*. "Vulgarity, obscenity, and flouting of conventional decorum are high on the list of common qualities."[1] Like mime, Winkler argues, the *Life of Aesop* is an expression of popular thinking otherwise largely lost because it was generally oral and subliterary. He sees Aesop as a traditional type of Grotesque Outsider whose criticisms of authority and hierarchies are licensed within the conventions of mime, which derived from figures such as Thersites and Margites.[2] Aesop's wisdom is thus also Socratic because it is aporetic and resistant to cultural norms. Apuleius, according to Winkler, does not so much descend to the level of the slapstick mime as he exploits its possibilities by speaking through the fatuous persona of Lucius and the mocked, abused, grotesque ass.[3]

H.J. Mason, in a compact paragraph within his essay, "*Fabula Graecanica*: Apuleius and his Greek Sources," suggests more broadly the importance of considering not simply the *Vita Aesopi* in connection with Apuleius, but the Aesopic fable, as "a form of literature which *assumes* that animals think like humans" (Mason [1978] 10). Mason points to the presence in the *Metamorphoses* (and almost certainly in the Greek original) of known Aesopic fables, and the quite explicit narration of the *Fox and the Crow* at *De Deo Socratis* praef. 4 (Fr. *Flor*. 4, Beaujeu), which is designated by Apuleius as a *fabula*. Mason thinks it possible that Apuleius had access to a version of the *Vita Aesopi*.[4]

Both of these critics make compelling arguments for considering Aesop's fables and the figure of Aesop himself in the *Vita Aesopi* as

---

[1] Winkler (1985) 280.
[2] On Aesop as a blame poet, see also Nagy (1979) 279-88.
[3] Winkler (1985) 276-91.
[4] Mason (1978) 10.

important elements of Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*. Nonetheless, I only came upon the *Life of Aesop* by accident since Aesop has been coopted and domesticated in ways that make him seem far from the iconoclastic "grotesque outsider" described by Winkler, and deter even mildly subversive people from reading him. Yet, while the tame fable of the 'Tortoise and the Hare' teaches us to persevere slowly and tediously in order to succeed, others, such as the 'Horse and the Ass' (Babrius 7) or the 'Donkey and the Wolf' (Babrius 122) present a brutal and socially conscious view of reality; still others, such as 'Aesop and the Farmer' (Phaedrus 3.3), cross all lines of modesty. When I finally read the *Life*, it became at once obvious to me that the episode in which Isis and the Muses give Aesop a voice offers an important support for my arguments about the function of Isis in the *Metamorphoses*. Further, the figure of the lowly Bakhtinian Aesop and his stories of talking animals can illuminate the much-discussed meaning of the *fabula*. While there is room for further investigation of the connections between Apuleius and Aesop, in this paper the connections I wish to draw between the *Metamorphoses* and the *Life of Aesop* are two-fold. The first part functions as a sort of supporting footnote to my earlier arguments about Isis in the *Metamorphoses*; the second explores more generally the intersections between Apuleius and Aesop in terms of the negotiation of elite and popular/written and oral language.

Use of the *Vita Aesopi* in connection with Apuleius presents several problems, however, as the text itself is of uncertain date and provenance and appears in several recensions which differ significantly from one another.[5] It is dated in its present form by two of its major experts to an era roughly contemporary with Apuleius; a Ber-

[5] There are several recensions, of which G and W (Greek) are fuller; of these G, which I follow here, offers details absent from the probably Byzantine W. The Latin version, the *Vita Lolliana*, underwent alterations in antiquity and the Middle Ages and is much scanter. In fact, the passage most important to my argument, that of Isis granting Aesop a voice, is absent from the Latin version and is markedly different in W. It is *Tyche* who gives Aesop a voice in the latter rather than Isis, interesting in light of Isis' self-designation at *Met*. 11.15 as Fortuna Videns. On the various recensions, see especially Holzberg (1993). The text is an amalgamation of materials from different eras. Some parts date back at least to the fifth century BC, according to M.L. West (1984) 126 who believes that at Aristophanes *Birds* 471-2 the verb πατέω implies perusal of a book and hence may imply some written Aesopic tradition as early as Aristophanes. He also points to a pseudo-Herodotean *Life of Homer* of the 1st or 2nd century *BC* as an analogy and generally suggests that the story of the slave Aesop developed into a novella as early as the 5th century.

lin papyrus fragment has been dated to the second or third century, giving a *terminus ante quem*; the references to Isis make a date before the first century B.C. unlikely.[6] Holzberg puts the Greek text not earlier than late second or early third century, though Perry had dated it earlier.[7] This range of dates is, however, clearly problematic in combination with uncertainties regarding the dating of Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*. Some scholars suggest that the stories circulated and were embellished orally and that it is not really the work of any one author, a *Volksbuch*, though others stress the more literary elements and the apparent structuring by a single author.[8] Parts are indebted to the Assyrian *Book of Ahiqar*; some portions may suggest Egyptian influence (particularly the section on Isis), given especially its discovery in Egypt.[9] In short, it is obviously impossible to know whether Apuleius could have known of the *Life*, and, if he did, in which of its many versions – though he unquestionably knew of Aesop and his works. One clearly cannot speak confidently of literary influence (in either direction), but rather of a more protean set of parallels.

Lucius and Aesop find voices through Isis

Just prior to his re-transformation, at the end of Book 10, Lucius, fleeing from the arena at Corinth, arrives at the safety of the seashore at Cenchreae and falls into a sweet sleep. At the beginning of Book 11, he awakes and sees the full moon just rising above the sea, and he prays to her. At 11.1, Lucius is clearly awake: *experrectus ... discussa pigra quiete … alacer exurgo*. He addresses the moon/goddess thus (though much abbreviated):

> *confestimque discussa pigra quiete laetus et alacer exsurgo … deam praepotentem lacrimoso vultu sic adprecabar: 'Regina caeli – sive tu Ceres alma frugum parens originalis … seu tu caelestis Venus … seu Phoebi soror ….' Ad istum modum fusis precibus et adstructis miseris*

[6] See, among others, Hägg (1997) 180-3.
[7] Holzberg (1993) 1-16; Perry (1936).
[8] For several defenses of the artistry of *Vita* G against attacks of incoherence and disconnected episodic narration, see Merkle (1996a), Mignogna (1992), and Holzberg (1993), Holzberg (1996c).
[9] On the importance of Egypt, especially in political terms—the Ptolemies connected Isis with the Muses and their queens with Isis—see Dillery (1999).

> *lamentationibus rursus mihi marcentem animum in eodem illo cubili sopor circumfusus oppressit.*
>
> quickly I shook off my sluggish sleep and arose happily and eagerly … then, my face covered with tears, I prayed to the mighty goddess… "Queen of heaven, *etc*." When I had thus poured out my prayer and added pitiable lamentations, my fainting spirit was once more engulfed in sleep.

It is clear that Lucius has been asleep, but wakes up, prays, then falls back asleep (*sopor oppressit*). The surprising part is that he is still a donkey here and yet prays an eloquent prayer before falling back asleep. Apart from the fact that ancient prayer was generally delivered out loud, the text provides specific markers that Lucius is crying tears and pouring out loud laments (*lacrimoso vultu*, *fusis precibus*, *adstructis miseris lamentationibus*). Most critics, distracted by the sequence of events and by the simultaneous presence of joy and tears, ignore the vivid picture in this scene of Lucius as a donkey weeping and pouring out a prayer, perhaps even reaching up his donkey arms to the moon.[10] While Lucius had previously been *markedly* unable to speak while a donkey, emitting hee-haws instead of Greek or Latin, in the presence of this goddess he regains his voice. My argument is that Isis is therefore associated with Lucius' voice and eloquence even before his re-metamorphosis and salvation.[11]

Isis is here more than simply the kind of savior goddess that she is in Ovid's Iphis story (Ovid *Met*. 9.666-797) or the convenient but gratuitous 'Saviorette' posited by Winkler;[12] she is a Muse figure, bestowing speech on Lucius, and, in a parallel sense, granting legitimacy to the novel as a genre. Isis, well-known as a multiform goddess, makes the novel's inclusive disunity a virtue; in a Baktinian sense, Isis's multiformity makes her the ideal patroness of the novel.

Nor is this reading dependent on a debatable interpretation of Apuleius' text alone. There is a strong tradition outside Apuleius that

---

[10] See, however, James (1987) 240 who notes Lucius' ability here to "pray and not bray" and suggests that the most frustrating aspect of his asinine state is now disappearing, but also emphasizes the humorous elements in the scene. Laird (1990), who fully explores the question of the narrator's perspective as a human and as an ass, notes that Lucius prays here in *oratio recta* and comments: "it is almost as if, with this wave of spiritual refreshment, Lucius's transformation back into human form had already been partly effected" (149); see further below.

[11] Finkelpearl (1998) 204-9.

[12] Winkler (1985) 286.

makes Isis responsible for the invention of writing. The Kyme aretalogy of the first or second century has Isis claim *in line 3*: καὶ γράμματα εὗρον μετὰ Ἑρμοῦ ("I discovered letters along with Hermes"; Kyme Aretalogy 3c), but perhaps the strongest testimony to the belief is found in Apuleius' countryman, St. Augustine, who mentions four times that she brought writing to Egypt (*City of God* 18.3, 37, 39, 40). Plutarch, too, associates Isis with culture, language, and the arts; he reports that many call her the daughter of either Hermes or Prometheus, and "that is why they call the leader of the Muses in the city of Hermes at once Isis and Justice [Δικαιοσύνη]" (*De Iside et Osiride* 3). In the context of these intellectual and philosophical associations of Isis with wisdom, learning and speech, we may discount biographical readings that explain the appearance of Isis rather than some other divinity as a life-experience of Apuleius or the whole book as a sacred text of Isis; nor should we ascribe her epiphany to Lucius' piety, for she is not merely a savior but also a Muse who can be held responsible in some sense for the composition of the book. Rather, Isis is especially appropriate because of her Muse-like ability to empower her devotees through words.[13]

All this documentation is almost irrelevant in the face of the testimony of the parallel passage in the *Vita Aesopi* where the role of Isis in giving a voice is immediately evident. In the *Life,* Aesop begins as a mute. A short way into the story, however, he performs a kindness for a priestess of Isis who happens to be passing the farm. She prays to Isis:

> Ἶσι μυριώνυμε ... εἰ μὴ πολυτάλαντον τὸν βίον αὐτοῦ διορθώσασθαι βούλει, ὃν οἱ ἄλλοι θεοὶ ἀφῄρηνται τὸ γοῦν λαλεῖν αὐτῷ χάρισαι. (5)
>
> Isis of a thousand names … if you are unwilling to repay this man with many talents for what the other gods have taken away, at least grant him the power of speech.

Like Lucius, Aesop lies down to go to sleep in an idyllic setting, upon which Isis appears with the nine Muses. She looks down at Aesop, ugly but righteous, and addresses the Muses, whom she calls θυγατέρες (daughters), implying that she too is a Muse or related to them:

---

[13] Most of the above is explained at much greater length and with fuller documentation in Finkelpearl (1998) 204-9.

> ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν τὴν φωνὴν ἀποκαθίστημι, ὑμεῖς δὲ τῇ φωνῇ τὸν ἄριστον χαρίσασθε λόγον' (7).
>
> I will restore his voice; and do you grant him most excellent speech with his voice.

Isis then removes the impediment from his tongue and persuades the 'other' Muses (τὰς λοιπὰς Μούσας) to give him each something of her own:[14]

> αἱ δὲ ἐχαρίσαντο λόγων εὕρεμα καὶ μύθων Ἑλληνικῶν πλοκὴν καὶ ποιήσεις (7).
>
> They conferred on him the power to conceive and elaborate tales in Greek.

After this pseudo-initiation, Aesop speaks not only competently, but in eloquent and inventive ways.[15] (Incidentally, Aesop's eloquence in *Greek*, as opposed to the native Phrygian probably spoken by slaves might be compared to Lucius' linguistic *desultoria scientia* mentioned in the prologue.) Similarly, Lucius, after his initiation, uses his newly regained voice to become a successful orator in the Roman forum and apparently the narrator of his own adventures. This passage then, is a strong support of my reading of Isis' role in Apuleius.[16] In both texts, though in the *Vita Aesopi* much more clearly, we may observe Isis' qualities as speech-granting Muse to the lowest of creatures.

Apollo vs. Isis

My second point involves the way that both texts associate Isis with the language of slaves and animals and, in different ways, create a tension or a polemic between two levels of language, which I would be tempted to call the 'Apollonian' and the 'Isiac.' Apollo, in the *Life of Aesop* is allied with the privileged and formal teachings of the

---

[14] There does seem to be a distinction between the role of Isis who removes the impediment to speech and the Muses who give him eloquence (Dillery 1999), but Isis remains an associate or even leader of the Muses.

[15] Both Dillery (1999) 279 and Mignogna (1992) 80 see elements of mystery initiation, *incubatio*, and literary initiation (Hesiod and the Muses) in the passage.

[16] Pervo (1998) 91 note 65 mentions the presence of the savior goddess, Isis, in both the *Life of Aesop* and Apuleius, but he, like Winkler who also notes the presence of Isis in both situations, sees Isis in Apuleius only as the goddess who restores Lucius' human form, not as a bestower of voice beforehand.

philosopher, Xanthus. He tries to keep his gifts of prophecy and poetry to himself. Isis, on the other hand, while clearly a figure of importance in her role as creator of writing, bestower of speech and, outside these texts but within the Middle Platonic tradition, as figure of *Sophia* and *Dikaiosyne*, nonetheless, does not disdain to be associated with donkeys and slaves and the sort of narrative generated by them. Isis (later Aesop himself) and Apollo, in the *Vita* seem to be in competition for the position of 'Leader of the Muses.' Apollo is characterized fairly early in the text, through an *aition* of Aesop's: Apollo had asked Zeus for the gift of prophecy, but when he gained it, he became so boastful and arrogant (ἀλαζονότερος ἦν ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις ἅπασιν) that he had to be reined in: Zeus established prophetic dreams so that mortals could themselves tell the future. Apollo then apologized and asked for his authority back, upon which Zeus sent some false dreams so that humans would need Apollo again (33). The story establishes, in the usual Aesopic way, the arrogant character of Apollo and his desire to possess exclusive knowledge. Interestingly, in this passage, Apollo is repeatedly called "the leader of the Muses," though the passage concerns prophecy, not poetry.

Aesop, on the other hand, is a slave, a Phrygian from Phrygia, extraordinarily ugly: pot-bellied, misshapen of head, snub-nosed, and swarthy, "a turnip with teeth," and "a dog in a basket;" he performs, or refers in his narrations to the entire spectrum of bodily functions, which link him closely to animal existence, especially in the beginning when he is a mute. Yet he also possesses a native and inborn cleverness that make him atypically heroic.[17] When he is slave to the philosopher Xanthus, he paradoxically teaches his conventionally learned Apollonian master about the proper use of language, the practical applications of intelligence and the uselessness of abstract philosophy. A large part of the *Vita* is focused on the clash between these two types of intelligence.[18] Later, Aesop advises kings and effects political negotiations through his clever solutions to riddles. He also becomes a sort of itinerant sophist in the later parts of the narra-

[17] Papademetriou (1997) discusses the ugliness of Aesop in relation to physical descriptions of heroes and others in Greek literature, concluding that, in essence, all elements of the description may be found in various places in Greek literature. It is worth pointing out, however, that Aesop clearly belongs to a small group of characters that are ugly yet have a certain license to speak and are heroized upon death.

[18] See Papademetriou (1997) 9-10.

tive; at *Vita* 101 and 124, he travels the world and lectures audiences for a fee, giving demonstrations of his wisdom and learning.

However, Aesop's downfall is that he angers Apollo when the Samians, in thanks for Aesop's help, offer him a shrine,

> ὁ δὲ Αἴσωπος θύσας ταῖς Μούσαις ἱερὸν κατεσκεύασεν αὐταῖς, στήσας μέσον αὐτῶν Μνημοσύνην, οὐκ Ἀπόλλωνα (100).
>
> Perry; αὐτὸν μνημόσυνον G;
>
> As for Aesop, after sacrificing to the Muses, he built a shrine to them, erecting in their midst a statue of Mnemosyne—or depending on the manuscript reading—of himself (?) and *not Apollo.*

Although, due to the textual crux, it is unclear whether Aesop sets up a statue of himself—the height of *hubris,* but not out of character—or of Mnemosyne, it is clear that he honors the Muses and *not* Apollo. Later, we hear explicitly that this action angers Apollo and that he takes revenge on Aesop for this slight to his honor (127). The significance of this action is well expressed by Ben Edwin Perry:

> For the Phrygian Aesop, like the Phrygian Marsyas in the ancient myth, is a champion of the native talent of the common folk as opposed to the formal learning of the aristocrats and academicians whose god is Apollo; and it is the deep-seated opposition between these two types of culture that explains why Aesop is the protégé of the relatively humble, though universal Muses, to the exclusion of the aristocratic Apollo, who is usually associated with them; and why, like Marsyas, having offended that proud deity, his death is brought about at Delphi by the god's followers and with the connivance of the god himself.[19]

Aesop's challenge to the established hierarchies, as Perry makes clear, extends not only to his social position—slaves talking back to their masters or resisting their immediate authority are a common enough phenomenon in ancient literature and presumably life—but also to the *literary and intellectual* establishment. By erecting a statue of himself with the Muses rather than Apollo (if this is what the text says), Aesop is polemically making a claim that *he* is the προστάτης τῶν Μουσῶν [leader of the Muses], a title frequently used of Apollo in the *Life* (three times in section 33 alone). Isis has a claim to this title as well, given her role in relation to the Muses in the beginning of the *Life* and in her description in Plutarch, seen above. Yet Aesop's master, Xanthus, denies him this title. At one

---

[19] Perry (1936) 15.

point when Aesop laughs at the professor under whom Xanthus studied, Xanthus accuses Aesop of "having the effrontery to walk on the Muses' Helicon" (36). Xanthus has studied in Athens under all the greatest philosophers and resents being outdone by the uneducated slave, Aesop. Yet clearly the *Life* advocates Aesop's claim to some part of Helicon. Perhaps most importantly, the fables for which Aesop is most famous and which appear scattered throughout the *Life* represent a type of 'literature,' or a patch of Helicon for those not educated in Athens.[20]

In this battle over types of culture, low and high, it appears that the moments of danger occur in the *Life* when the fables and their teller take on lasting physical form. For most of the narrative, Aesop has travelled the world giving advice orally, telling exemplary tales of the type that old grandmothers, cooks, slaves, and characters in Apuleius tell aloud. By the end of the narrative, he has come to inhabit a historical/fictional world in which kings establish their power by setting each other insoluble riddles. In this world, Aesop ranks as a figure of the utmost importance, solving problems for kings by using loopholes in logic and employing 'down-home' common sense. For example, he devises for King Lycurgus the impossible city in the sky by using birds who support children in the air. Looking back at the passage in which Aesop angered Apollo (100, above), we may observe that just before he erected the statues, he *wrote down* his fables:

> ὁ δὲ Αἴσωπος οὖν συγγραψάμενος τοὺς ἰδίους λόγους καὶ μύθους, τοὺς ἄχρι καὶ νῦν ὀνομαζομένους, κατέλιπεν εἰς τὴν βιβλιοθήκην, καὶ λαβὼν παρὰ τοῦ βασιλέως ἐπιστολὰς ... ἔπλευσεν εἰς Σάμον. (100)

[20] The claim that Aesop represents a patch of Helicon for those not educated at Athens opens up various thorny questions of the work's audience, the nature of the author and his sympathies especially in light of the claims that this is a *Volksbuch*. Hägg (1997) 196-7 emphasizes the learnedness of the author who is able to represent so accurately for the purposes of ridicule the nature of philosophical argument. He disagrees with Hopkins (1993) 19 who sees the text as asking us to side with the slave against the master. I would argue that the text need not necessarily be socially revolutionary to open the question of whether popular wisdom has its validity. In contemporary society, for example, there is great interest in popular culture on the part of the intellectual establishment; popular culture has been brought into the curriculum of the university, but the social and even intellectual hierarchies remain.

> Then Aesop, writing down his own words and stories that go down under his name even now, *left them at the library*, and getting a letter from the king … he sailed to Samos.

When Aesop returns to Samos, he is voted honors and an Aesopeum. It is here that Aesop dishonors and incurs the wrath of Apollo by neglecting to put a statue of him in the shrine. Later, another king, Lycurgus of Babylon realizes the importance of all that Aesop has done for *him* and he sets up a golden statue of Aesop with the Muses, establishing a great festival to his wisdom:

> ἐκέλευσεν οὖν ὁ Λυκοῦργος ἀνδριάντα χρυσοῦν ἀνατεθῆναι τῷ Αἰσώπῳ μετὰ καὶ τῶν Μουσῶν, καὶ ἐποίησεν ἑορτὴν μεγάλην ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐπὶ τῇ τοῦ Αἰσώπου σοφίᾳ. (123)

> Lycurgus ordered a gold statue of Aesop and the Muses to be set up, and the king created a great festival in honor of Aesop's wisdom.

It is immediately after *this* that Aesop makes the unwise decision to travel to Delphi where he meets his end. Aesop has transgressed the boundary between the two cultures; he has written down the tales—*fabulae* from *fari*, to *speak*—that belong to oral and popular culture and placed them in a library, and he has been immortalized in a shrine and in gold along with the Muses (twice, it seems), usurping Apollo's privilege. As long as he kept to his slave status and as long as his discourse was as ephemeral as his bird-city in the sky, he was safe, but writing down *fabulae* and placing them in a library represented in the most concrete form this transgression of boundaries of class and intellectual standing that enraged Apollo. More directly, Aesop foolishly mocks the Delphians, calling them the descendents of slaves; the Delphians, of course, are closely linked with Apollo since his most important seat is located in their land. They plant a gold cup from the temple in his pack (reminding us of Apuleius *Met.* 9.9-10) with the connivance of Apollo and convict him. He takes refuge in the shrine of the Muses, but to no avail, tells some fables about class war, then some rather irrelevant fables including one about being lost among donkeys, and jumps off the cliff himself, calling upon τὸν προστάτην τῶν Μουσῶν [leader of the Muses] to witness the injustice. Apollo, however, as his antagonist, does not listen to him and Aesop dies. Soon he is avenged, since Apollo's people, the Delphians, are afflicted with famine and receive an oracle

from *Zeus* that they should expiate his death.[21] The *Life* ends ambiguously, but with the suggestion that other nations punished Delphi to avenge Aesop's death (142). The antagonism between Aesop and Apollo is obvious and stems quite clearly from the moment when Aesop sets up a statue of himself with the Muses, usurping Apollo's honors. His attempt to redefine the acceptable realms of the Muses toward the inclusive 'Isiac' has failed in the immediate present, but all of the sympathies of the *Life* have pointed toward a validation of the inclusion of popular fable, slave and animal talk amid the realms of Helicon.

In Apuleius, there is a similar dialectic and tension between the two types of discourse, though it does not take the form of overt battle that we see in the *Vita*. Apuleius' use of the folktale and his emphasis on stories that are heard rather than written in a high literary form is well known (as well as problematic), as Scobie's book, *Apuleius and Folklore*, or the many debates over the origins of the Tale of Cupid and Psyche demonstrate. Just as prominent is Apuleius' vast learning. There is a growing bibliography on the prominence of both Latin and Greek literary models in the *Metamorphoses*, while Sandy's and Harrison's recent books on Apuleius' relation to rhetoric and philosophy emphasize the fact that Apuleius *did* himself undergo an elite education in Athens which he was eager to show off.[22] The popular and the elite, the low and the high coexist in Apuleius but not without tension.

Indeed, in several places, Apuleius explicitly signals this tension of high and low as well as that between written and oral. In the prologue, the speaker states:

> *At ego tibi sermone isto Milesio varias fabulas conseram auresque tuas benivolas lepido susurro permulceam – modo si papyrum Aegyptiam argutia Nilotici calami inscriptam non spreveris inspicere.* (1.1)
>
> But I will weave together for you in that Milesian style varied tales and I will soothe your kindly ears with a charming whisper – if only you will not refuse to look at an Egyptian papyrus inscribed with the sharpness of a Nilotic reed.

---

[21] In some ways the best example of the deadly link of writing and fables in Aesop's case is his wish stated at 96 (a point by which Aesop seems to be engaged in writing) that the fable of the "wolves and the dogs" be engraved on his tombstone.

[22] On Apuleius and folklore, see summaries in Schlam and Finkelpearl (2000), Scobie (1983). On Apuleius' literary models, see e.g. Finkelpearl (1998), Graverini in this volume; on Apuleius' learning, Harrison (2000); Sandy (1997).

Although Apuleius begins by mentioning *sermo, fabulae* and *aures*, he quickly draws attention to the fact that we are *reading* a written text (*papyrum, inscriptam, calami, etc.*) This much has been often noted.[23] Beyond that, the geographical designations are significant: *sermo* and hearing are associated with Miletus, while reading the papyrus written with a pen is associated with Egypt, the Nile and hence Isis, the goddess of writing. The Egyptian elements are not merely a hint of the Egyptian goddess at the end, but explicitly point to her function as the goddess of *writing*. Even in the first few words, the tension between heard speech and written words is made evident and framed, as the second reader can see, in terms of Egypt and Isis.

Further, in Book 10, Apuleius tells the reader that we will be reading a 'tragoedia' not a 'fabula' and that the story will ascend from the sock to the buskin (*iam ergo, lector optime, scito te tragoediam, non fabulam legere et a socco ad coturnum ascendere*, 10.2). At the beginning of Book 8, the narrator of the Charite story says that he will tell us (*referam*) what happened, but that the *doctiores* who have pens (*stilos*) will enter it on paper into a formal history (*in historiae specimen chartis involvere*, 8.1). All these passages signal explicitly the tension between the levels of discourse, whether low/high or oral/written. Often, of course, such observations by the narrator are comic and ironic, games played with the reader; nonetheless, their humor depends on the coexistence of conflicting narrative levels that are obvious to the audience.

There is another sense in which the *Metamorphoses* may be read as incessantly Aesopic, which has already been hinted at above and is brought out vividly when Lucius observes the mime of the Judgment of Paris and stops himself after a rant about the evils of bribery:

> *sed nequis indignationis meae reprehendat impetum secum sic reputans: 'ecce nunc patiemur philosophantem nobis asinum?' rursus unde decessi, revertar ad fabulam.* (*Met*. 10.33)
>
> But lest anyone criticize the outburst of my indignation, thinking to himself, 'hey! Are we now to put up with a philosophizing ass?' I will return to my *fabula* where I left off.

It is worth noting that here the narrator, Lucius-*auctor*, and not merely Lucius-*actor* is characterized as a donkey for a moment, an '*asinum philosophantem*' who refuses to stick to his *fabulae*. Indeed,

[23] See, for example, Kahane (2001).

the first-reader does not know that Lucius ever cast off his asinine state and can imagine that the whole novel is supposed to be narrated by an ass, an assumption encouraged by the quotation above. Andrew Laird, noting the problems of authenticity of narration that arise (deliberately) from our awareness that "our narrator is supposed to be an ass" observes, "Many of the self-referential passages ... which emphasise the presence of the narrator also draw attention to the paradox of that narrator having been—and possibly still being—a beast unable to speak or write."[24] If understood in the context of fable, however, the phenomenon need not be read as paradoxical; we are brought back to Mason's comment above that there is a genre that 'assumes' that animals think (and talk) like humans.

The donkey speaks again and more directly (as *actor*) at 11.1, as we have seen. When read from an Aesopic perspective, at that moment in Book 11 when Isis gives Lucius speech when he gazes on her in the form of the full moon, it is a donkey that speaks (and cries and reaches up his arms), a fabulistic talking animal. While comic in a sense, this scene is also a vivid reminder of the traditions of animal *fabulae* that lie somewhere in the background of the novel. Isis, the goddess who, in many traditions, invented writing and who, as I just argued, is associated with pens and papyrus from the first few words, makes a donkey speak, and in so doing, she validates the fable and the novel form. Unlike the vengeful and elite Apollo of the *Vita Aesopi*, Isis affirms the value of *writing down* the tales of animals, slaves, and old women. Under Apuleius' Isis, slaves and donkeys can speak and philosophize.

One further passage both confirms perfectly and problematizes my arguments. Later in book 11, as one of his culminating experiences, Lucius encounters writing made from animal shapes.[25]

> *Mithras … de opertis adyti profert quosdam libros litteris ignorabilibus praenotatos, partim figuris cuiusce modi animalium concepti sermonis compendiosa verba suggerentes, partim nodosis et in modum rotae tortuosis capreolatimque condensis apicibus a curiositate profanorum lectione munita.* (*Met.* 11.22)

[24] Laird (1990) 147-8. Laird seems to be the only critic to call attention to this narrative inconsistency.

[25] Roger Beck pointed out this connection to me at the conference at York University in Toronto (see below).

> Mithras … brought out from the hidden quarters of the shrine certain books in which the writing was in undecipherable letters. Some of them conveyed, through forms of all kinds of *animals*, abridged expressions of traditional sayings; others barred the possibility of being read from the curiosity of the profane, in that their extremities were knotted and curved like wheels or closely intertwined like vine-tendrils.

On the one hand, the hieroglyphics here described are a perfect embodiment of the synthesis of animals and writing that I have argued represents the 'Isiac', but on the other hand, this Isiac writing is exclusionary rather than democratic—not least in Apuleius' impenetrable style here—certainly quite far from the populist fable-language of Aesop. Perhaps it is best not to push consistency of images too far, and my categories have been intended as suggestive ones. The conjunction of animals and privileged writing may convey more generally an elevation of the animal, which would parallel Lucius' experiences. Further, reference to hieroglyphics reminds us that theriomorphic gods have a prominent place in Egyptian religion, offering Apuleius a crossroads between fable and Isiac beliefs.

Were there more space, I would pursue the inseparable corollary to the comments above: the literary hierarchies here discussed are inextricable from social hierarchies; raising subliterary forms to the status of literature is not only literary but potentially socially revolutionary; slaves and animals who gain a voice are no longer slaves or animals in the same sense. There has been recent interest in reading the *Metamorphoses* as a narrative about slavery (the donkey being a figure for the slave) and the Aesopic fable is quite often a vehicle for slaves to talk surreptitiously about their lot, as Phaedrus tells us (III. *Prol*. 35).[26]

It is also worth pursuing the social and literary changes that are taking place in the second century A.D. when Apuleius and the anonymous author of the *Vita* were writing (or, in the latter case, perhaps compiling and polishing). This is the moment of the novel's heyday, insofar as one can tell – a genre that was relatively new and is not much mentioned, if at all, and which relies, even apart from the Apuleian example here discussed, on popular material and perhaps was even designed for a new, less elite readership (though this is

[26] On Apuleius and slavery, see especially Fitzgerald (2000) Chapter 5; Bradley (2000).

much debated). In this period, early Christians were composing the Gospels and other texts using a less literary style and aiming at a less educated audience. This is not to ignore the simultaneous flourishing of an interest in the arcane and in showing off obscure knowledge in the context of the Second Sophistic and in the archaizing tendencies of Apuleius' contemporaries, and much else of this sort, but to suggest that there is at least interest in broadening the definition of what may be considered literature or what may be legitimately written down, and in what style. Apparently, too, if my reading of these two texts is valid, there was resistance to such a broadening by some conservative, 'Apollonian,' sectors of the intellectual world. For the moment, however, my subject has been limited to a consideration of the importance of Isis as goddess of writing, Muse empowering the low in the recovery and glorification of their voices, advocate of the legitimacy of the fable.[27]

[27] This paper was, apart from ICAN 2000, also delivered in different forms at York University, Toronto for the conference, "Pinning the Tale: Apuleius in his Social Context" (Spring 1999) organized by James Rives, and at UC Santa Barbara in February 2000. I would like to thank those audiences for their useful comments.

This page intentionally left blank

THE GRAND VIZIER, THE PROPHET, AND THE SATIRIST. TRANSFORMATIONS OF THE ORIENTAL *AHIQAR ROMANCE* IN ANCIENT PROSE FICTION

Marko Marinčič

The supplement to some printed editions of the *Arabian Nights* contains a story of 'Ahiqar,' wise counsellor to the kings of Assyria Sennacherib (704-681 BC) and Esarhaddon (681-669 BC), who was betrayed by his adopted son Nadan, narrowly escaped execution, triumphed over the Pharaoh in a riddle-contest, and rebuked Nadan by a series of parables. The Arabic *Ahiqar romance* is part of a long medieval tradition which includes preserved versions in Syriac, Armenian, Old Turkish, Old Church Slavonic, fragments in Ethiopic, and many later translations. Except for the Slavonic version, which is adapted from a lost Greek *Ahiqar*, this tradition is conventionally referred to as the 'Oriental' *Ahiqar romance*: it is best represented by the (superficially Christianised) Syriac and Armenian versions which may be traced back to the first century AD.[1]

Even before an extensive fragment of a 5th century BC Aramaic *Ahiqar romance* was discovered among the ruins of the Jewish colony on the Nile island Elephantine in 1907,[2] the 'first international best-seller' could assert its antiquity on grounds that it was known in some form to the Greeks of the classical era.[3] Recent work on the subject has established that *Ahiqar* was used as a model for a number of works of prose fiction stemming from different cultural environments but written or preserved in Greek. These include: the 2nd (?)

---

[1] Principal editions: Nau (1909); Conybeare, Rendel Harris, Smith Lewis (1913); Charles (1913). For a more recent discussion see Küchler (1979) 348-52, 358-63, and Lindenberger (1985). The English translation used here is from Charles (1913).

[2] The English edition referred to here is by Lindenberger (1985). Since the Elephantine discovery, it seems probable that an '*Ahiqar romance*' containing both the narrative and the wise sayings was fixed in writing before the mid-sixth century, probably in Aramaic; cf. Lindenberger (1985) 481-2.

[3] See now Luzzatto (1992).

century BC *Tobit*,[4] 1st/3rd century *Life of Aesop*,[5] the fragmentary *Tinuphis*,[6] and Ps.-Callisthenes' *Alexander romance*.[7]

Compared to the picturesque Oriental versions, the Aramaic text is disappointingly short and lapidary. In spite of its venerable age, it is certainly not the kind of fairy-tale to protract Scheherazade's life. Here is the story: Having no son to succeed him, Ahiqar adopts his nephew Nadin (variant form of the same name as that in the Oriental version) and teaches him his wisdom; but Nadin betrays his uncle's confidence and intrigues against him. Ahiqar is accused of high treason and sentenced to death but spared by the swordsman whose own life he had once spared. Here the text breaks off; loosely appended to the narrative part is a collection of wise sayings addressed to Nadin.

The Oriental version is more specific in attributing the misfortunes of Ahiqar, including the disloyalty of his adopted son Nadan, to his being unfaithful to God (who replaces the 'gods' of the pagan original).[8] The 'Teaching of Ahiqar' is incorporated into the narrative, and there is much vivid detail in the description of the events following Nadan's intrigue. After having been spared by the swordsman, Ahiqar has to hide for a long time in a dark pit under his house, surviving on the food and water secretly delivered to him by the swordsman. At some point he repents of his faithlessness and bursts into a fervent prayer. Soon afterwards, King Sennacherib, to whom the Pharaoh of Egypt had sent a series of nonsensical questions and demands, regrets the death of his counsellor, and Ahiqar is able to emerge victoriously from his hiding place, with unkempt locks and overgrown nails. He travels to Egypt, solves the riddles of the Pharaoh, and, on his return, he imprisons, beats and starves Nadan, telling him parables until he dies.

The supposition that the Syriac text (the best or earliest representative of the Oriental version) with its graphic realism and drama is nothing but an 'Oriental' elaboration of the Aramaic original seemed confirmed when an Ahukar emerged on a list of distinguished schol-

---

[4] For a fuller treatment of *Tobit* see Wills (1995) 68-92.

[5] See Beschorner, Holzberg (1992) 177-8.

[6] Editions: Haslam (1981); Stramaglia (1992a); Stephens, Winkler (1995) 400-8; López Martínez (1998) 254-65; on *Tinuphis* and *Ahiqar* see Anderson (1984) 158, and Kussl (1992).

[7] Stoneman (1992) 107-10.

[8] Cf. *Ach. arm.* 1.4; Lindenberger (1985) 486.

ars who were active at the court of Esharaddon,[9] that is, of the king of the legend. It was not until 1992 that M.J. Luzzatto in her well documented article proposed the intriguing hypothesis that the Aramaic text is rather an anthological abridgement of a much earlier text which was very close to what we now call the Oriental version.[10] She showed that the Oriental version reflects the historical circumstances of the 7th century BC, and although she may insist too strongly on Ahiqar as the possible author,[11] the 'Pillar of Ahiqar' allegedly plagiarised by Democritus[12] in fact suggests an 'autobiographical'—if fictional—first person narration of *res gestae* of Ahiqar.

But even if most of the material of the Oriental version is in fact much later than the 'historical' Ahiqar, a version close to this came into circulation some time during the 2nd century BC at the latest. As I have demonstrated,[13] *Tobit* owes a great deal of its plot, structure and symbolism to a comparable version of *Ahiqar*, and I am going to base my interpretation of the *Vita Aesopi* on the supposition that its author had a similar text in front of him. I will argue that in using Ahiqar as a model for their protagonists, *Tobit* and the *Vita* share a marked tendency to reduce the austere figure of the aristocratic Grand Vizier to an alternative type of a sage. These are, respectively, an exiled Jew who is persecuted because of his faith, and a rebellious slave who makes his master, the false philosopher Xanthus, an object of scurrilous satire. The generic affiliation of the *Vita* with the comic-realistic novel is now commonly recognised,[14] and it can be argued that the straightforward vulgarity of this text is, in part at least, intended to emphasise the contrast between the obscene satirist and the hieratic Oriental sage. In *Tobit*, the story of Ahiqar and his treacherous nephew is explicitly present as a negative foil to the story of a faithful son who undertakes an adventurous Oriental journey to marry a girl who was "destined for him from eternity." It will also be shown that in Judaising *Ahiqar*, the author surprisingly uses proce-

---

[9] Van Dijk (1962) 44-5.

[10] Luzzatto (1992); (1994).

[11] While the historicity of the story may be regarded as irrelevant to its later destiny, there is a strong possibility for a historical author of animal fables, who, through his legend, in turn influenced the legend of Aesop the teller of fables; see further Holzberg (2001) 16-18.

[12] Clem. Alex. *Stromata* 1.15.69 (299 DK).

[13] Marinčič (1995).

[14] See Holzberg (1995a) 16; on the intended readership see Hägg (1997) 196-7.

dures and stock motifs of popular fiction in a way that anticipates early Christian novels.

The Tobit Romance

In *Tobit*[15] Ahiqar is depicted as a Jew, a nephew of the old Tobit, which may well imply the existence of a Jewish *Ahiqar*. At all events, by representing Tobit as a relative of such an international celebrity, the author aims to authenticate his fiction even in the eyes of non-Jews. Historical verisimilitude, however, is not the only reason why he abandoned the usual practice of tacitly appropriating the splendour of such a celebrity for a minor (or fictitious) figure. He obviously wanted Ahiqar and Nadan to remain present as negative models for Tobit and Tobias, who, as their names suggest (hebr. *tob* meaning ‘good’), receive their authentication on an exemplary rather than historical level. Even more surprisingly, the otherwise majestic figure of Ahiqar is used as a less perfect example of a Jew who has lost and recovered his faith.

As a high dignitary at the court of Assyria, Tobit supplies his exiled compatriots with food and clothing and buries those put to death, until somebody informs the king about his illegal activities, with the result that Tobit falls out of favour with Sennacherib. Soon afterwards the next king, Esarhaddon, employs Tobit’s (less orthodox)[16] nephew Ahiqar (1.21-2 S). Later Tobit is struck blind, and we are informed that Ahiqar took care of him for some time (2.10). Thus the author signals to the reader that the story of Tobit and his family are to be thought of as taking place concurrently with that of Ahiqar. As in the Oriental Ahiqar, there is a symmetrical structure with two speeches imparting wisdom (*Tobit* 4 ~ *Ach. or.* 2; 14 ~ 8) and two prayers (*Tobit* 3 ~ *Ach. or.* 1.3-7; 11 ~ 4.18-19). The wisdom material of Chapter 4 was obviously influenced by the Oriental Ahiqar,[17] and the deathbed testament of Tobit (Ch. 14), which finds its correspondence in the ‘Parables’ of Ahiqar (the harangue Ahiqar addresses to Nadan after his victorious return from Egypt), actually contains a paraenetic comparison of two paradigmatic destinies:

[15] References are to the edition of Hanhart (1983).
[16] Cf. *Tobit* 1.4-5,10.
[17] Nau (1909); Simpson (1913); Charles (1913) 717-18; Küchler (1979) 364-79.

> See, my son, what Nadab did to Ahikar who had reared him. Was he not, while still alive, brought down into the earth (ζῶν κατηνέχθη εἰς τὴν γῆν)? For God repaid him to his face for this shameful treatment. Ahikar came out into the light, but Nadab went into the eternal darkness (εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸ σκότος τοῦ αἰῶνος), because he tried to kill Ahikar. Because he gave alms, Ahikar escaped the fatal trap (ἐξῆλθεν ἐκ τῆς παγίδος τοῦ θανάτου) that Nadab had set for him, but Nadab fell into it himself, and was destroyed. (*Tobit* 14.10-11 S [*NRSV*])

Ahiqar 'brought from light into darkness' clearly recalls the dramatic scene of the Oriental version where the hero prays to God to restore him to life:

> And I, Ahiqar, was cast into darkness in the pit beneath. And I was hearing the voice of my bakers, cooks, and butlers as they wept and sobbed within my house. [...]
>
> O God, just and righteous, and that sowest grace upon earth, hear the voice of thy servant Ahiqar, and remember that he sacrificed to Thee fatted oxen like suckling lambs. And now he is cast into the darksome pit where he seeth no light ... (*Ach. syr.* 4.17-19)

Further, the image of the *trap* may be taken as an allusion to the *fabula docet* of the Oriental Ahiqar:

> Thereat Nadan swelled up like a bag and died. And to him that doeth good, what is good shall be recompensed: and to him that doeth evil, what is evil shall be rewarded. And he that diggeth a pit for his neighbour, filleth it with his own stature ... (*Ach. syr.* 8.41; cf. *arm.* 8.38).

Symbolism of light, darkness, and blindness is a recognisable feature of all extant versions of Ahiqar,[18] and this is why Tobit refers to an Ahiqar resurrected from apparent death as a counterpart to his own recovery from blindness. On an earlier occasion, he replies to the angel Raphael who had come to his rescue by explicitly comparing his blindness to death:

> What joy is left for me any more? I am a man without eyesight; I cannot see the light of heaven, but I lie in darkness like the dead who no longer see the light. Although still alive, I am among the dead (ζῶν ... ἐν νεκροῖς). I hear people but I cannot see them. (*Tobit* 5.10 S [*NRSV*])

---

[18] "My son, better is he that is blind of eye than he that is blind of heart; for the blind of eye straightway learneth the road and walketh in it: but the blind of heart leaveth the right way and goeth into the desert." (*syr.* 2.48; cf. *arm.* 2.51); cf. also *syr.* 8.33; *aram.* 10.156-8; 14.213-15.

Again, these lines are perhaps meant to recall Ahiqar, who hears the voices of his bakers, cooks, and butlers in the dark of his 'grave.'

One can therefore suggest that the symbolism applied to the apparent death and 'resurrection' of Ahiqar is somehow materialised in the exemplary story of the blind man, and that the author wanted us to consider his Jewish hero as a kind of spiritualised Ahiqar.[19] If, then, the author deliberately spiritualised the motif of *Scheintod*, is there any reason to regard the personage of Tobit as a 'novelistic' counterpart of Ahiqar?

To begin with, no reader of Tobit will fail to notice that although almost everything in *Tobit* is the doing of God's will, one can easily give an account of the basic story without any reference whatsoever to God or Raphael. Virtually every event in the story has a double motivation. The apparition of the Angel in human disguise, for instance, does not end the tribulations of Tobit and his family. Instead of immediately rewarding Tobit for his faith (the symbolic θέμα he believed his charity would bring him; cf. 4.9), Raphael offers to accompany his son on a journey to fetch a previously deposited 'treasure,' ten talents of silver Tobit once had left in trust with his relative Gabael. Here, the metaphoric language of Tobit's moral instruction (cf. the extensive use of the imagery of the 'way' in Chapter 4) begins to be materialised into adventures that are not only profane but also evidently inspired by popular fiction.[20] Tobias' journey roughly coincides with, and is meant to correspond to, Ahiqar's travel to Egypt,[21] but it is full of dangers and fantastic adventures. While washing at the Tigris, Tobias is almost swallowed by a gigantic fish; the angel instructs him to catch it and to save the heart, liver, and gall, because they are effective against evil spirits and against blindness (6.1-9).

As only Raphael knows, the actual goal of the journey is Tobias' marriage with his relative Sarah, whose seven previous husbands had

---

[19] As I argued elsewhere (Marinčič [1995] 207-8), "charity which delivers from death" (*Tobit* 14.10-11; *Tobit* 4.10 BA) is a spiritualised counterpart to the retributive relationship which existed between Ahiqar and the swordsman (cf. *syr.* 8.2; 8.37: "Like as God has kept me alive on account of my righteousness so hath He destroyed thee for thy works").

[20] For the folk-tale of the 'Grateful Dead Man' as a model see Deselaers (1982) 280-92.

[21] The 'Elymais' of *Tobit* 2.10 is either a wrong translation of the Aramaic word for 'hiding place' or a substitution for Egypt; see Lindenberger (1985) 489.

been killed by the jealous evil spirit Asmodaeus on the wedding night. In the bridal chamber the final combat with the demon takes place: Tobias and Sarah ward him off by praying and by burning the heart and the liver of the fish—another instance of the archangel relying on popular fiction rather than on his own supernatural powers.

As L. Wills pointed out, *Tobit* is exceptional among all 'Jewish novellas' in that it does not adhere to the conventional model of treating female sexuality. Apart from *Tobit*, these texts follow the conventional scenario according to which "female sexuality is piously repudiated, not channelled (along with male sexuality) through a chaste adolescence into wedlock."[22] The text of *Tobit* of course makes no reference to the possibility that the nuptial séance was followed by other more profane events, but there is a *latent* 'love romance,' which, albeit theologised, bears a strong resemblance to the standard pattern of the Greek ideal novel. Beginning with Chapter 3, the story of Sarah runs parallel to that of Tobias: at the same time that Tobit is offended by his wife and asks God to take his life, Raguel's maids accuse Sarah of having murdered her seven husbands. In response to these accusations she first thinks of hanging herself, then she prays to God for release by death. Thereupon God sends his angel to unite the two destinies, because, as the Archangel later explains to Tobias, Sarah was "destined for him before the world was made" (μεμερισμένη πρὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος, 6.18) – a truly sentimental conception hard to find elsewhere in Jewish writings.

Although the motif of ideal marriage has no direct counterpart in *Ahiqar*, it is nevertheless very likely that it is meant to contrast with a certain incident of the Oriental *Ahiqar* where Nadan, *instead of burying his father*, gathers "the lewd folk" to a tumultuous party and seeks to do with Ahiqar's wife "the way of man with woman" (*Ach. syr.* 4.14-16; cf. *arm.* 2.25).[23] Since the 'Teaching of Tobias' (ch. 4) is obviously conceived against the negative example of Nadan, it can hardly be a coincidence that it begins with a commandment regarding the burial of the father (4.3) and culminates in the warning regarding fornication/idolatry (πορνεία, 4.12; cf. *Ach. syr.* A 2.6, 10). Tobias successfully avoids this negative example by chastely marrying a girl

---

[22] Wills (1994) 230.

[23] Similarly, in the *Vita Aesopi* 103 the adopted son of Aesop seduces a concubine of the king, and the fragment of *Tinuphis* mentions a γυνὴ μοιχάς as responsible for the sufferings of the hero; cf. Kussl (1992) 28.

destined for him from eternity (~ belonging to his own tribe). The symmetry of the Hellenistic 'ideal marriage' is there to foil the debaucheries of Nadan (πορνεία as fornication), and the Jewish marriage with a close relative is set in contrast to the infidelity of a 'Jewish Nadan' (πορνεία as idolatry[24]). The latent 'ideal' novel which the author of *Tobit* uses as a didactic aid to religious instruction is obviously the sort of story which could attract his readers, otherwise he would not have recurred to it in advocating the anachronistic usage of endogamous marriage.

Still, the narrative seems to be missing a *Scheintod* scene. But, this time, there is indeed a proper 'novelistic' *Scheintod*, one that takes at least part of its inspiration from the negative example of Nadan, whom his licentiousness led "down into the darkness." It takes place in the bridal chamber of Sarah, and it is accompanied by the darkly ironic picture of Sarah's father digging a grave in the solitude of the night. Then he sends a maid to collect the body, but she finds Tobias sleeping quietly at the side of Sarah, and the servants have to hurry to fill in the grave before dawn.

The Life of Aesop

The *Vita Aesopi* (according to the G version[25]) represents the legendary fable-teller as a Phrygian slave who is grotesque in appearance and mute but extremely pious. He once shows the way to a priestess of Isis, and the goddess, in addition to granting him speech, persuades the Nine Muses to confer on him the power to craft elaborate stories in Greek. As a result, he makes a brilliant career. Starting as a slave of the charlatanical philosopher Xanthus, whom he repeatedly rescues from his troubles, he moves up the ranks to become a wise diplomat, and he succeeds in saving the people of Samos from an attack by Croesus of Lydia. Finally, he settles down as a chamberlain of the King of Babylon. He adopts a young man of good family named Helios, who eventually turns against him and accuses him of high treason, but the swordsman spares Aesop and keeps him hidden until the king regrets the death of his counsellor. Now Aesop may

[24] Cf. 1 Ch. 5.25; Ps. 72,27.

[25] I follow the editions of Papathomopoulos (1991) and (1999); the English translation is from Wills (1997) 181-215.

appear from his hiding place. He travels to Memphis, wins a riddle-contest against the Pharaoh, and, on his return, he teaches Helios his lesson. At the peak of his fame, he travels to Delphi and insults the locals, who then accuse him of having stolen a golden cup and throw him headlong from a cliff. Not much later, a famine comes over the land of Delphi, and the inhabitants receive an oracle from Zeus that they should expiate the death of Aesop (according to the W version, by establishing a hero-cult in his honour).

As is well known, the Babylon-Memphis section of the *Vita* in which Aesop helps the King of Babylon against the Pharaoh (101-8) is modelled on a lost Greek version of *Ahiqar*. Aesop, who acted as an impudent slave of the philosopher Xanthus in the first part of the text, is now suddenly found in the role of a 'Grand Vizier' who, instead of telling obscene stories, professes loyalty and submission. The whole passage is still considered by many to be an interpolation, but as N. Holzberg demonstrated in his analysis of the text's structure, the presence of the Oriental model extends beyond that section. The structure of the Babylonian section is mirrored almost exactly in the preceding episode where Aesop helps the people of Samos against Croesus (a letter from a king—Aesop on a journey—three Aesopic *logoi* in rapid succession). The fact that there is no single clear reference to this episode in the *testimonia* about Aesop is best accounted for if we conclude that the story was borrowed from the legend of Bias,[26] one of the Seven Sages, and it is readily arguable that the author deliberately conflated Bias and Ahiqar into the figure of Aesop as a traditional sage.[27] Holzberg also pointed to the structural parallel between various instances of Aesop being wrongfully accused, put into jail and finally triumphing by his *logoi*.[28] Ahiqar probably served as the prime model here.

While it can be observed that Aesop gradually advances from a mute to the helper of the philosopher Xanthus, the saviour of the people of Samos and the Grand Vizier of the Babylonian king,[29] his sudden death at the hands of the Delphians is commonly regarded as an element inherited from the early legend of Aesop. Nevertheless,

---

[26] For a list of parallels between the Aesop of the *Vita* and the Bias of Plutarch, *The Banquet of the Seven Sages*, see Holzberg (1992a) 68.

[27] Holzberg (1992a) 66-9; (1993) 8-9; on Aesop and the Seven Wise Men see Jedrkiewicz (1997).

[28] Holzberg (1992a) 36.

[29] Holzberg (1992a) 41.

the author thought it worthwhile to motivate the reversal by the traditional pattern of tragic *hybris*:[30] blinded by the glamour of his success, Aesop places his own statue amid the Muses, thus incurring the wrath of Apollo, the true Leader of the Muses (100 G).

But even so, the Babylon-Memphis passage is functional within the whole only insofar as it motivates the *hybris* of Aesop, which in turn motivates his traditional death at Delphi, and one may wonder whether the author would sacrifice his picture of a comic hero for that of an aristocratic sage if it were only to explain the traditions concerning his death.

A different approach is taken by S. Merkle, who argues that the paradoxical inversion of Aesop's fate corresponds to the basic conception of the work as a representation of a topsy-turvy world. Within this conception, the *hybris*-motif is not the starting point of Aesop's misbehaviour, rather Aesop's superiority to his counterparts has limitations from the very beginning. The author uses the device of ironic foreshadowing in order to prepare the reader for the Delphi section where Aesop himself turns out to be subject to the anarchical mechanisms of this world in which 'what is up must come down.'[31]

This, however, does not necessarily preclude the exploitation of the element of *hybris*, which, to be more precise, gradually increases as Aesop advances in his career. Moreover, the fact that Aesop expects the Delphians to pay him for his eccentric performance and that he, the former slave, insults them as contemptible slaves (126), is a clear sign that as an Oriental vizier Aesop came into conflict not only with his former *role* as a slave but also with his nature as a satyr-like satirist. One should not forget that, in spite of his magnificent eloquence, his looks at least are still the same as in Chapter 1 where he is depicted as a creature of inexpressible loathsomeness:

> He was truly horrible to behold: worthless, pot-bellied, slant-headed, snub-nosed, hunchbacked, leather-skinned, club-footed, knock-kneed,

---

[30] Holzberg (1992a) 65.

[31] Merkle (1996a) 229-32; cf. Pervo (1998) 85-97. Apart from the episode of Aesop wearing down Xanthos's guests by an overdose of pork tongue (chs. 51-5; Merkle 232), the most striking example is the *aition* of deceptive dreams, in which the arrogance of the prophetic god Apollo and his degradation foreshadow the future fate of Aesop (ch. 33 G; Merkle 231); Merkle curiously fails to note that Apollo's eventual reinstatement by Zeus foreshadows the final reversal, the plague sent by Zeus and the heroisation of Aesop.

> short-armed, sleepy-eyed, bushy-lipped – in short, an absolute miscreant.

The ambivalent representation of the paradigmatic fable-teller is probably as old as the legend itself. Although the status of Aesop as a slave and (probably) his deformity were traditional, he could sometimes be ranked with the Seven Wise Men.[32] It seems, however, that the uncertainty concerning his appearance and his social position was never treated in terms of a binary opposition, as is the case in the *Vita*. While Aesop as an extreme example of a Mad Wise Man is inconceivable without the influence of Cynicism,[33] Aesop the conservative sage is clearly modelled on Ahiqar and Bias. The question, therefore, is not how the author reconciled various traditions about Aesop, but rather *why* he decided to represent the evolution of a 'maddened Socrates' into a second Bias and a second Ahiqar.

In what follows, I shall try to demonstrate that the *Anonymus*, in addition to using the story of Ahiqar as a foil for Aesop the Satirist, made the Ahiqar passage functional within the overall plan of the *Vita* according to which the rapid *cursus honorum* and the tragic end of the satirist illustrate the limitations of satire, in the simple sense that Aesop the obscene satirist is tolerated only as long as he does not aspire to usurp the affirmative type of wisdom represented by Ahiqar, Bias, and Apollo. In support of this, I will adduce some further instances where Ahiqar might have been operative.

As Holzberg has noted, the pattern of Ahiqar 'imprisoned' and saved, which became a recurring pattern of the *Vita*, is foreshadowed already in chs. 4-8, where Isis rewards Aesop by the gift of speech for having shown her priestess the way.[34] There is a possible 'cryptic prophecy' of future events in the prayer the priestess says on behalf of Aesop (5.7-8 G):

> δυνατὴ γὰρ σὺ καὶ τὰ ἐν σκότει πεπτωκότα πάλιν εἰς φῶς προ⟨αν⟩ελέσθαι "… for you can bring into the light those things that have fallen into darkness."

The technique used here, Holzberg observes, is that of the prophetic god of the New Comedy.

---

[32] Jedrkiewicz (1989) 135-43; (1997).
[33] Jedrkiewicz (1989) 116-27.
[34] Holzberg (1992a) 45 note 60.

In view of the prominent role that symbolism of light and darkness has in *Ahiqar*, it is arguable that the prophecy more specifically looks to the scene of the Babylon-Memphis section in which Aesop, betrayed by his adopted son Helios, undergoes a *Scheintod* on the model of Ahiqar (his hiding place is designated as τάφος in 104.7 W; cf. 107.5 W: ζῶντα αὐτὸν εἰς τάφον ἔβαλον), and the obvious conclusion is that the 'consecration' of Aesop by Isis may be in its turn modelled on the 'conversion' of *Ahiqar*, that is, on an aspect of the *Scheintod* scene which is crucial to the story of Tobit the Blind Man, but curiously absent from the corresponding passage of the *Vita Aesopi*. In support of this it may be necessary to add other observations. The conception of wisdom and speech as gifts of the divinity is prominent in all versions of Ahiqar (e.g., *aram.* 92-5); this is already an obvious point of contact with Aesop. Further, although the image of the divinity who 'humbles and exalts' is conventional, it may be significant that it is also found in *Ahiqar*:

> If [*yo*]u wis[*h*] to be [*exalted*] my son, [*humble yourself before Shamash*] who humbles the [*exalted*] and [*exalts the humble*] (*aram.* 149-50; cf. *arm.* 2.35).[35]

There is an identical saying in Tobit's first Ahiqarian 'Testament,' where it is linked with the conception of God as the only source of wisdom (4.19 S+BA), and in Tobit's farewell speech (14.10) it is combined with the '*Moral von der Geschicht*'' of Ahiqar ('Nadan fell into his own trap,' see above). Now the same moral is found at the conclusion of the 'Menandrian' prologue-scene of the *Vita*, where the fellow-slaves of Aesop steal some figs and falsely accuse Aesop of having eaten them. Aesop proves his innocence by vomiting, and his fellow-slaves can learn that "a person who connives an evil scheme against another ... ."[36] The Menandrian colouring of the whole passage[37] does not rule out Ahiqar as a model; quite on the contrary: in the immediately following Isis-scene, the liberation of Ahiqar from his pit is likewise used as one of the models for a comic 'prologue,' and I would suggest that in both cases the comic mode is partly in-

---

[35] Compare also the mutilated passage of the Ahiqarian 'Teaching of Aesop' in *Vita Aesopi*, P.Oxy. 3720, ed. Haslam (1986) lines 56-60.

[36] 3.25-6 G; Papathomopoulos conjectures two iambic trimeters on the model of 3.20-1 W.

[37] Holzberg (1992a) 44 note 53.

tended to contrast with the gravity of the corresponding scenes of *Ahiqar*.[38]

Once we acknowledge the possibility that Ahiqar stands behind the 'Prologue' of the *Vita Aesopi*,[39] it may come as a surprise that the Babylon section, where Aesop is directly cast into the role of Ahiqar, is almost entirely devoid of any religious dimension: Aesop feels no need to resort to divine help while hiding in his 'grave'. What is more, nothing in the text suggests that the reader is supposed to feel pity for him.

In fact, it can be plausibly argued that the reader is actually expected *not to* sympathise with the Babylonian Grand Vizier. Aesop is no more the same innocent buffoon he used to be; now he is an arrogant teacher of conventional wisdom who seeks to dethrone the sun-god Apollo. The fact that the adopted son of Aesop (~ Nadan) is called Helios in the G version may be significant in this respect. First of all, we are supposed to take the name as an ominous foreshadowing of Aesop's subsequent death at the hands of the people of Apollo. It is a suggestive sign that Aesop's triumph over Helios-Nadan is not to be taken only as the climax of his career but most of all as a prelude to his downfall. But there may be a second reason. In the Aramaic Ahiqar it is the *sun-god* Shamash who acts as the administrator of justice, and it is quite possible that the author, following his usual procedure, conflated the traditional Aesop, who is killed by the Del-

---

38 In a much similar way, the prosimetric (!) *Tinuphis romance* hellenises the personage who saves Ahiqar by giving him the name of the comic tricky slave Sosias, and the whole thematic complex of 'saving' (Tinuphis as 'the king's saviour,' 5; 'the brick which saved the Prophet,' 12, apparently a removable brick concealing the aperture through which Sosias delivers food to Tinuphis) playfully suggests the cult title of the Ptolemies; cf. Stephens, Winkler (1995) 402 (without any reference to Ahiqar).

39 There are some further points of contact. The *Vita* is the first written source to represent a deformed Aesop; the mid-fifth century Attic cup representing a dwarfish man and a fox bears no direct reference to Aesop, and Luzzatto (1992) 57-62 suggests 'Ahiqar preaching to the treacherous Nadan.' In any case, it remains possible that the hero of the *Vita* owes his uglines, in part at least, to Socrates/Marsyas and to Ahiqar returning from his hiding place to rebuke his nephew (*syr.* 5.11). As Ahiqar condemned to darkness served as a model for Tobit, Ahiqar condemned to silence is a possible inspiration for the dumbness of Aesop; both Tobit and Aesop are rehabilitated for their piety. Cf. *Ach. aram.* 156-8: "May El twist the mouth of the treacherous and tear out [*his*] tongue./ May good eyes not be dimmed,/ [*may good*] ears [*not be stopped,/ and may a good mouth love*] the truth and speak it"; *syr.* 2.53: "My son, let not a word go forth from your mouth, until thou hast taken counsel within thy heart: because it is better for a man to stumble in his heart than to stumble with his tongue."

phians, with Ahiqar, who is tested by Shamash, and with Nadan, who is punished by the same god for having abused the divine gifts of speech and wisdom.[40]

The suppression of the religious theme, perhaps including the 'conversion' and 'resurrection' of Ahiqar (which would have presented an ideal counterpart to the old tradition of 'Aesop resurrected'),[41] is understandable in view of the function of the passage: while Ahiqar is tested by God(s) to prove his faith, Aesop triumphs once more only to reach the culmination of *hybris*, and in this he resembles Nadan rather than Ahiqar. The incongruity of the Ahiqar-section thus becomes deeply meaningful: the ugly but pious Aesop is consecrated by the popular goddess Isis to become a satirist, a reversed Ahiqar, not a second Bias, Ahiqar, or Apollo. His ascent to the rank of an aristocratic sage not only motivates an individual act of *hybris* but is in itself hybristic, an offence against Apollo, and, paradoxically, a betrayal of his satirical mission, which in the first part of the work received a positive evaluation as a 'soft' form of *hybris* tolerated by gods and society alike. Aesop's 'conservative' posture in the Ahiqar section ('wise sayings' and 'loyalty' instead of 'plebeian' fables) therefore reveals not the incongruity of the passage with the rest of the narrative,[42] but the conflict of the Ahiqarian Aesop with his 'satirical' self,[43] and this is why it leads to his downfall. The escalation of *hybris* leads Aesop to the situation where his *logoi* become useless, and he is actually punished in the manner of a treacherous Nadan. The moral of the *Ahiqar romance* used in the comic 'Prologue' as a prelude to the Isis scene now becomes applicable to

[40] The diplomatic adulation of Aesop (chs. 113-15), who styles the expected victory of Lycoros over Nectanebo as a victory of Zeus over the radiant Sun (cf. *Ach. arab.* 6.17-24 and *aram.* 108), is perhaps another example of ironic foreshadowing: Aesop prophesies his final 'victory' over Apollo without knowing that it is going to be posthumous. There is a possible parallel to this in the *Moicheutria* (P. Oxy. 413, now in Cunningham [1987] 47-51), a mime of an anonymous author, which Andreassi (2001) showed to be modelled on the *Vita*: the name of Aesop's girlfriend *Apollonia*, who involuntarily causes the hero's condemnation to death, may be allusive of the role played by the god in the *Vita* (cf. Andreassi 219).

[41] Plat. com. fr. 70 Kassel-Austin; Hermipp. Call. fr. 10, 30-31 Wehrli; Zenob. *Paroemiographi* I 47 p. 18; Phot. Bibl. 152b, 11-13. The 'resurrection' of 'Aesop' is also staged in the *Moicheutria*; see Andreassi (2001) 222-3.

[42] Thus Oettinger (1992) 21-2.

[43] This is probably the reason why the 'Teaching' stands in the traditional place of the 'Parables'; for other solutions see Perry (1952) 5-10; Lindenberger (1985) 480; Haslam (1986) 150-1; Holzberg (2001) 94.

the fabulist himself, this time in a profoundly tragic sense. Aesop turns out to be only a very imperfect copy of Ahiqar, both in being a deformed satirist and in meeting a tragic end.

Since Isis and the hostile Apollo are absent from the W version, they are still regarded by a minority of scholars as secondary.[44] But Aesop's opposition to the Olympian gods is implied already in the fable of the eagle and the dung beetle, which belonged to the oldest core of the legend,[45] and it could have been precisely the scarab who suggested to the author of the *Vita* the popular goddess Isis and the Muses as a pendant to the aristocratic Apollo, the Leader of the Muses.[46] The author of G was probably the first to interpret the antagonism between Aesop and Apollo in terms of *hybris*, thus simplifying the more complex original relationship between hero and god,[47] but this does not necessarily mean that he had such a version of the *Vita* in front of him; he may have simply *returned* to the tradition of an 'Apolline' Aesop (although this would produce a circular argument, since W is the only witness of such a tradition). Be that as it may, in the text of W, as it stands, the implied conflict between

---

[44] Notably by Ferrari (1997) 12-20, although the papyrological evidence he adduces does not seem conclusive.

[45] According to Von Möllendorff (1994) the triumph of the dung beetle over Zeus originally suggested the triumph of Aesop's popular wisdom over the official wisdom of the Delphian god; the author of the *Vita* (135-9) established a new parallel between the scarab and the Muses, thus sacrificing the existing *tertium comparationis* in favour of a 'Dionysiac' Aesop who is close to the Muses.

[46] Even if the scarab suggested the sun-god Apollo in the first place (Luzzato [1996] 1314-15), it does not follow that the W version is original; the 'unnatural' association of the ugly Aesop and the dung beetle with the Delphic god rather supports the more complex relationship between Aesop and Apollo as represented by the G version.

[47] G. Nagy (1980) 289-92, with a tendency to over-emphasise the 'beneficent' aspects of Apollo in G. The ambivalent relationship between hero and god (antagonism in life/symbiosis in cult) is also a major point of contact with the Gospel of Mark (Pervo [1998] 115 on Mark 14.36 and 15.34), which (or the presumable common source of Mark and John) Wills (1997) 27-9 classifies with the type of the 'cult narrative of the dead hero,' especially since Mark is unique in representing the death of Jesus as a temporary estrangement from God (ibid., 45-6). What makes this particular parallel less obvious is the possibility that the overt hostility of the 'aristocratic' Apollo is an answer to the usurpatory aspirations of the 'popular' Aesop, whose punishment is therefore not wholly undeserved. In fact, the devaluation of the cultic Aesop (if there was one) corresponds to his being an anti-Ahiqar, an anti-Socrates (see below and Pervo [1998] 113-17), and to his positive evaluation as a *tragic* satirist. But it does not follow that Ahiqar is a more relevant model for Mark; the popular, 'Isiac' fable-teller Aesop furnishes an important parallel with Jesus, and the post-mortem 'unity in cult' is effectuated, however indirectly, by Zeus.

Aesop and Apollo is only a partial aspect of the last section with very limited relevance to the whole, whereas in G the conflicting roles of Aesop shed light on what might have been the foremost concern of the author: the antagonism between satire and affirmative wisdom. While W fails to explain why Apollo supports the Delphians in killing a second Bias and a Grand Vizier, that is to say a representative of the same 'official' wisdom, G suggests that as an 'initiate' of Isis and a satirist he is a usurper on that territory.[48]

While noting the similarity between Aesop the deformed satirist who is 'consecrated' by Isis, and Apuleius' Lucius the Ass, Winkler considered the choice of the popular goddess Isis as gratuitous and ascribed the 'impiety' of Aesop to the fact that the slight of Apollo was traditional.[49] But it follows from what has been said so far that the religious theme, if not the choice of Isis, is somehow relevant to the satirical character of the *Vita*, and I would suggest that it is relevant in a way that is almost entirely opposite to its function in Apuleius. Once more, it will prove helpful to read Aesop through Ahiqar.

As a pious slave and an 'initiate' of Isis, Aesop is allowed to play tricks on his master, the self-styled philosopher Xanthus (compare 5.7-8 G with 54.5 G: τὰ ἄνω κάτω λαλεῖν) – he may do what Nadan, himself an apprentice of a 'philosopher,' could not possibly afford to do. Whereas Nadan was 'led into darkness,' among other things, for trying to violate his adoptive mother, Aesop is free to surrender to the seduction of his professor's lustful wife (who, incidentally, catches him masturbating and cannot resist the 'satyric' size of his virile member, cf. 76 G). He may yield to his *serviles voluptates* precisely because he is a slave, and because his sexual object is really an object of satire; here, the anti-hero receives positive evaluation as a satirist who can expose other people's vices because he is already 'punished.' There is at least one parallel sexual episode in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*, notably the one in which the rich *matrona* seduces Lucius the ass (10.20-3). But whereas Lucius is punished by becoming a non-speaking passive vehicle of satire only to attain personal salvation, Aesop is deformed but pious at the beginning, and he is

[48] The *hybris* of Aesop thus becomes an element of cohesion hard to be ascribed to an interpolator; since W lack such cohesion, the suppression of Apollo's hostility is almost certainly an apologetic intervention.

[49] Winkler (1985) 286-7.

accorded the gift of speech[50] in order to perform the inherently hybristic 'public' office of a satirist. The gift of the divinity turns out to be really a test of Aesop's piety – a further correspondence with Ahiqar, only that the new office of Aesop is inherently transgressing, and he transcends the role assigned to the satirist precisely by assuming the roles of Bias and Ahiqar.

There is a similar ambiguity about Aesop as a double of Socrates. Like Socrates, Aesop is compared to the satyr Marsyas (100 G; cf. Pl. *Symp.* 215b), but in his case the main parallel lies in the offence against Apollo, which is eventually punished. It has been noted by Schauer and Merkle that Aesop is styled as a lascivious anti-Socrates in the prison before his death (cf. *Phaedo* 60d for Socrates composing a hymn to Apollo and putting some Aesopic fables into verse).[51] I would suggest that the eleventh hour invocation of Apollo (142 G) and the obscene novellas Aesop narrates as a blasphemous counterpart to the last hours of Socrates can be seen as a tragically ironic recognition of his error. He poignantly illustrates his loss of mind by the story of the simple-minded girl who once saw a man coupling with a she-ass (ἡ ὄνος), and, upon asking him what he was doing, she begged him to "put some sense (ὁ νοῦς) in her" too (131). Aesop, who had been once allowed to take advantage of his master's foolish wife, suddenly finds himself in the reverse role, in the passive role of the ass; but whereas Lucius is punished by becoming an ass only to merit salvation, the ass of the novella symbolises the tragic end of the carnal anti-Socrates.[52]

If there is a moral to be drawn from from the Platonic intertextuality of the *Vita*, it may be that the unholy wisdom of the Socratic Wise Mad Man is tolerated only as long as he is able to counterbalance it by a certain amount of Socratic self-deprecation, and the self-

[50] E. Finkelpearl in this volume adduces the Isis scene of the *Vita* in support of her earlier thesis regarding the theme of language in the *Metamorphoses*; see Finkelpearl (1998) 184-217.

[51] Schauer/Merkle (1992).

[52] In the *Metamorphoses* we encounter a carnal 'anti-Socrates' at the beginning (1.6), and the reference to the philosopher at 10.33 anticipates the deliverance of Lucius from the 'bondage of flesh'; on this, see Schlam (1970). It is beyond the scope of this paper to compare the use of Plato in both texts; there is of course no use linking the Platonic intertextuality of the *Vita* with Isis, but things would change considerably if the Greek *Onos* with its obscene ending (the intended exhibition of the donkey copulating with a condemned woman) was meant to be a parody of an 'Isiac' *Metamorphoses*.

denying eschatology of Socrates is the only way to justify his claim to immortality. This is exactly what Aesop is unable to achieve, and this is why he must fail. There is one more reversal in the end, and Aesop is honoured posthumously by a hero-cult, but unlike Socrates, Ahiqar,[53] *and* the legendary Aesop, he is not resurrected, and the founding of the cult is ironically indifferent to the essentially transgressing character of his mission.[54]

As in the case of *Tobit*, both the departure from and the use of the Oriental model are highly relevant to the genre of the *Vita*. *Tobit* uses 'novelistic' motifs of journey, treasure, magic and romantic love in order to offer an idealised positive counterpart to the Oriental *Ahiqar*. Similarly, the *Life of Aesop* uses motifs and conventions typical to the comic-realistic novel in fashioning a comic hero, a satirical anti-Ahiqar. At some stage of this procedure of appropriating *Ahiqar*, however, *Tobit* and the *Vita Aesopi* cease to be 'novelistic' texts, and their heroes abandon the realms of fantasy and realism to become respectively an exemplary figure of Jewish spirituality and an exemplary Satirist, a protagonist of a didactic narrative and the hero of an implicitly moralising fictional biography.[55]

---

[53] It may be relevant that here Aesop is once more cast in the role of the triumphing Ahiqar, only that this time his death is not a *Scheintod*, and his victory is posthumous.

[54] The final 'reconciliation' is mirrored in the aetiological conclusion of the Dung Beetle fable (139), and von Möllendorff (1994) 152 note 19 regards this conclusion as an invention of the Anonymus; but while it is believable that the original fable ended with the triumph of the scarab, which was meant as an insult against the Delphians, the aspect of "triumphale Alterität" (ibid. 161) is in my view deliberately suppressed in the *Vita*.

[55] My great thanks go to the organisers and to the audience of ICAN 2000. I am especially indebted to Niklas Holzberg, Antonio Stramaglia, and Mario Andreassi, for useful suggestions, and to Jason Blake for helpful improvements.

LIVING PORTRAITS AND SCULPTED BODIES IN CHARITON'S THEATER OF ROMANCE

Froma I. Zeitlin

The aim of this essay is to explore in brief Chariton's reliance on the power of images, real or imaginary, along with the varied uses of figuration, and, more generally, the arts of viewing. Together, they offer precious testimony to the dynamics of visual enthrallment and the aesthetics of representation in this post-classical age. The atmosphere of the novel is one that is everywhere subject to the specular captivation of a lover's eye, enraptured by the beauty of corporeal images and caught in the aesthetic snare of that first and fatal gaze. Love in its vicissitudes now constitutes the single and only touchstone of value for individual, family, community, and later, even royalty itself, particularly when the woman in question is Callirhoe, whose remarkable beauty, as is often said, is "something more than human" (1.1.2).[1]

In this superheated milieu, first in Syracuse, just after the defeat of Athens in the Sicilian expedition, and eventually reaching all the way into the heart of barbarian territory, the *pathos erôtikon*, as Chariton calls his story, is governed from beginning to end by the influence of Aphrodite and Eros. On the public level, the erotic spell turns entire cities and their inhabitants into passionate spectators of a suspenseful drama and, as often as possible, into astonished gazers at the figure of divine beauty that walks among them. All the world is now a stage. City streets, rooftops, harbors, assemblies, courtrooms, theaters, and temples are transformed into sites for performance and spectacle, for the display of rhetorical and visual splendor, along with the theatrical surprises of reversals, peripeteias, and recognitions attended by crowds of citizens. On the private level, desire recreates the image of the beloved in a visual network of nocturnal dreams, visitations, and imaginative reveries, so that on two critical occasions it leads to the manufacture of actual sculpted images for permanent public display. The ideal of beauty is now firmly lodged not only in the figure of di-

[1] All textual citations of Chariton refer to the Budé, 2nd edition, originally edited by G. Molinié (1979) and revised by A. Billault (1989).

vinity but in the work of art as its material embodiment. At the same time, subjective fantasy now shows its increased power to cross the borders between dream and waking, between image and reality, truth and illusion, as between past and present, life and death, and finally between mortal and immortal.

Whether such images are called *eikones*, *agalmata*, or *eidôla*, whether they are actual doubles of the person or their representations, all still remain within the general parameters established since the archaic age, which divide them according to opposing contexts of mortality (funerary art, ghosts) and immortality (statues of the divine). Common to both modes is the impulse to turn absence into presence.[2] But their power is now augmented in the light of several new factors: the rise of the art of portraiture in the Hellenistic age and beyond, the visual cults of kings and emperors, especially under the Empire, the more frequent allusions to uncanny epiphanies, as well as the recording of intimate dream experiences. Above all, it is the focus on eros that instigates the exercise of *phantasia,* that subjective faculty of the imagination, shared by artist, poet, and spectator alike.[3] *Phantasia* often draws upon the cultural storehouse of a visual repertoire, available in the ubiquitous presence of works of art, in both private and public contexts, as well as in theatrical performances. These provide a vivid point of reference, often more vivid than reality itself, and are on a par, if not more so, with the myths and models of old.

Dionysius expresses it nicely, when summoned to the court of the Great King in company with Callirhoe, he voices his anxiety about exposing her to the eyes of others:

> As an educated man (*pepaideumenos*), he knew Eros was *philokainos* (fond of novelty). That is why poets and sculptors depict him with bow and flame, of all things the most light and unstable. He was visited by the memory of ancient stories (*palaia diêgêmata*) which told of the inconstancies (*metabolai*) associated with beautiful women (4.7.6-7).[4]

---

[2] See, for example, Vernant (1991a).

[3] *Phantasia* shifted attention from the mimetic faculty and technical excellence in the production of images to the valorization of a kind of interior vision, which was capable of forming a picture in the mind through a combination of subjective intuition and intelligent contemplation, one that was meant to induce the same experience in listeners and viewers alike. See, especially, Watson (1988) and (1994) and Manieri (1998), with further bibliography.

[4] All translations by Reardon (1989).

With the image of the mythic Helen in mind, Dionysius expects only to find other Parises in Asia to steal his beloved away from him (5.2.8). Even more telling, Callirhoe is continually represented in the image of Aphrodite, to whom she prays and for whom she is consistently mistaken.[5]

There are three significant visual elements that structure the composition of the work. First, epiphany and its corollary, uncanny apparition; second, sculptural representations, and third, dream images of various sorts, which in Greek thought from the archaic age on, are designated as optical events.[6] The entire story, in fact, revolves around the visual events of the *Scheintod* or 'apparent death' to which first the heroine and then the hero are subjected. This situation creates one level of symmetry between them – for Callirhoe through Chaereas' actual witnessing of her death (or so he thinks) and she through a dream signifying his death (or so she thinks). The result of these errors is that each provides a prominently placed tomb for the other; he in Syracuse and she in Miletus. Both are erected by the sea to attract maximum attention from all passers-by (1.6.5; 4.1.5-6). Private grief is elevated to public viewing.

In addition to the tomb, Callirhoe had manufactured a life-size image of her beloved as a monument to her love. The model was at hand in a portrait ring of him (an *eikôn*), the only possession left her by the brigand when he found her in the tomb and later sold her to Dionysius in Ionia (1.13.11; 4.1.10).[7] Throughout the first part of the text this portrait is Callirhoe's means of communicating with her beloved. She had kissed it in the first instance, while confiding her thoughts to the absent Chaereas (1.14.9-10), and the ring comes into play in even more startling fashion when she places its *eikôn* on her belly and imagines, even ventriloquizes, a three way conversation between herself, her unborn child, and her husband (2.11.1-3). Which alternative should she choose? To abort Chaereas' baby, or marry Dionysius and betray her husband (her child or her chastity)? She re-

[5] See, especially, 2.2.6; 2.3.6; 2.3.9; 3.2.14; 3.2.17.

[6] See, for example, Björk (1946).

[7] This funerary effigy is first called an *eidôlon*, when it heads the procession, and then in the next sentence, we are told "she embraced Chaereas, covering his *eikôn* with kisses" (4.1.11). In earlier Greek idiom, the two terms are not used interchangeably, but now the portrait image, the *eikôn* of Chaereas, has also become the simulacrum of a dead person (4.1.10-11). It is now an image of an image, we might say.

calls that she had dreamed of Chaereas the night before as a ghost image (also designated as an *eikôn*), who entrusted the child to her. In a quotation borrowed from the Iliadic scene (23.66-7) in which the ghost of Patroclus appears to Achilles as an *eidôlon*, Chaereas too "appears the same to her, like in size and eyes and voice" (2.9.6). Now, on the next day, realizing she cannot rear the child alone, a slave in another man's house, she relies on this dream message as granting her permission to marry Dionysius. Not least of her reasons is her hope that the child might wholly resemble her husband (2.9.4; 2.11.2), and turn out to be an exact *eikôn* or likeness of Chaereas (cf. 3.8.7).

At the climactic moment in the King's court, Mithridates, the king's satrap, organizes a brilliant *coup de théâtre* to exonerate himself from the charges of adultery brought by Dionysius against him. He had fallen in love with Callirhoe and is now, as it happens, also the master of Chaereas, who had been sold to him as a slave. Now he arranges for Chaereas' sudden apparition: "Appear noble spirit," he cries. "Your Callirhoe summons you" and Chaereas obliges on cue with a grand entrance (5.7.10). Callirhoe herself is dumbfounded at the sight, and later, when parted from him without even an embrace, she touches her eyes:

> Did you truly see him? Was that my Chaereas or did I just imagine it? Perhaps Mithridates sent an *eidôlon* for the trial. They say there are magicians in Persia. Still he actually spoke – everything he said showed he knew the situation (5.9.4-5).

If Callirhoe hesitates for a moment to trust her own vision of the man she thought was dead, his appearance, she now realizes, was already predicted. The night before the trial she had another dream. "She saw herself in Syracuse entering Aphrodite's shrine, still a maiden, then returning from there and seeing Chaereas and her wedding day. She saw Syracuse all decked out with garlands and herself being escorted by her father and mother to the bridegroom's house." She was on the point of embracing Chaereas when she suddenly awoke. Her servant interprets the dream as a good prophetic omen (*enupnion*). "What you dreamed is what will happen in reality – your *onar* is really a *hupar*. Go off to the King's courtroom as if it were Aphrodite's temple; recall your real self and recover the beauty you had on your wedding day" (5.5.5-7).

Chaereas' 'resurrection' closes the first circle around the device of the *Scheintod,* which had begun with Callirhoe's supposed death in book 1 (1.5.1) and was later matched by his own in book 3 (3.7.4-5; cf. 4.1.1).[8] Danielle Auger has indicated the vital function of the ten dreams, strategically located at different moments in the text, which structure the narrative.[9] While these dreams may take different forms, virtually all the major characters (with the exception of Chaereas) are dreamers or are prone to imaginative reveries (Callirhoe, Dionysius, the Great King, even the bandit).[10] A widower himself, still grieving for his wife, Dionysius has a strange dream about her in the beginning of book 2, which he recounts to his steward, Leonas. "I saw her clearly (*enargôs*)," he says: "she was taller and more beautiful – and she was present at my side as though a real waking vision (*hupar*). It seemed to me that it was the first day of our married life. I was bringing her home after our wedding from our estate by the sea, and you were singing the wedding song" (2.1.2-3). "You are indeed a lucky man," exclaims Leonas, "both in your dream (*onar*) and your waking life (*hupar*). You are just about to hear of the very thing you viewed (*tetheasai*)." What he means, however, is the extraordinarily beautiful woman he had just purchased for his master. Dionysius' dream itself is a preview of Callirhoe's later dream in Babylon (5.5.5), mentioned above, although they signify different outcomes in this tangled triangle of lovers. Dionysius's dream may recall his dead wife but it forecasts, not her resurrection, but rather his marriage to Callirhoe, as though she were a more beautiful double than the former. Callirhoe's simpler vision, on the other hand, looks ahead to a

---

[8] The final reversal of Callirhoe's *Scheintod* in the first book will only take place in the last book, when Chaereas will 'awaken' her, as it were, when he finds her in a deathlike state in her prison cell on the island of Arados (8.1.5-8; cf. 7.7.8). It is only fitting that the one who 'killed' her at the beginning now 'revives' her. I am indebted to Belle Waring for these perceptive observations.

[9] Auger (1983).

[10] Dreams: Theron, the brigand (1.12.5); Leonas, Dionysius' steward (1.12.10), Dionysius (2.1.2), Callirhoe (2.3.5; 2.9.6; 3.7.4; 4.1.1; 5.5.5-6); the Persian king, (6.2.2; 6.7.2). Not all of these dreams, it should be said, are of equal value and there is more to visual experience than dreams. Chaereas, the non-dreamer, is more often on the outside – an object rather than a subject, an image rather than an image maker. If the text signals the primal attachment between Chaereas and Callirhoe through the formal device of shared patterns of experience and explicit references to their doubling, Dionysius matches Callirhoe in his access to the resources of interior life and capacity for vivid imaging, whether in dreams or in the actual making of an image.

straightforward reunion with a ‘resurrected’ Chaereas and a return to Syracuse. Both dreams draw upon memories of past existence just at the moment when the beloved object is about to materialize into the narrative, and as the servants’ interpretations in each case emphasize, these dreams also refer to a reality yet to come: for Dionysius, his second marriage; for Callirhoe, her ‘re-marriage’ to Chaereas. These are not just strictly prophetic dreams, or *oneiroi* according to Artemidorus’ taxonomy (1.1), but are also vivid manifestations of a subjective state, *enupnia*. Conversely, Callirhoe misinterprets her previous dream in Miletus regarding Chaereas’ fate as signifying his death, because she reads it allegorically, when, in fact, her vision corresponds to the actual situation of the plot (his captivity in chains, 3.7.4-5).[11]

The placement of these dreams in the text is even more significant and here again I refer for a moment to Auger’s analysis. The dreams begin in the novel only after the *Scheintod* of Callirhoe and her exit from the tomb and take place during Callirhoe’s sojourn in Ionia, when at least one of the spouses believes the other one to be dead. Flanking this section of the narrative, material signs are constructed for these so-called ‘dead,’ the empty tomb of Callirhoe and the cenotaph raised for Chaereas. Callirhoe has her last dream (the one that takes her back to her past) in Babylon, on the eve of the day when she will see Chaereas alive once more. In this haunted atmosphere of death and revival, the sequence of dreams tends to suggest the atmosphere of the world beyond.[12] The several Homeric quotations at strategic moments that invoke the scenes between the mourning Achilles and the *eidôlon* of the dead Patroclus supply the essential cue that the characters are not only occupying a border zone between dream and waking, but are also situated on the threshold

---

[11] Callirhoe dreams of Chaereas’ plight twice. In the first, (3.7.4) she sees Chaereas in chains, as mentioned above, which corresponds to the reality of his capture in Miletus. Her second dream in which she sees a host of oriental brigands with torches setting the warship on fire, while she herself tries to help Chaereas (4.4.1), may also be a species of wishful thinking in the light of the official report of the event and Chaereas’ ‘death.’ The first one in particular, which occurs on the very night of the attack, illustrates “one of the essential characteristics of the theorematic dream according to Artemidorus,” as Auger (1983) 42 rightly claims, namely the “immediacy of realization.” Common to both types of dreams, however—the theorematic ones and those that recall the past while forecasting the future—is the crossing of borders between the zones of dream and reality.

[12] Auger (1983) 47-8.

between this life and the underworld. From the moment when one of the brigands finds Callirhoe alive in the tomb and takes her for an uncanny *daimôn* (1.9.4) to the theatrical display of Chaereas as an *eidôlon* (initially summoned as a *daimôn* by Mithridates at the King's court, 5.7.10), the novel uses the device of the parallel *Scheintods* "to weave together the three strands of dream, love and death, and give them a mythic dimension that sustains the power of the text to bring simulacra and images to life."[13] Callirhoe herself, when Dionysius asks this unknown woman for her story, is reluctant to give more than her name and the fact of her free birth. Her former life, she says, is just an *oneiros* and a *muthos*, a dream and a myth (2.5.6-7).

Auger's argument that in these four books (2-5) the lovers have both become images for one another also relies on an important detail I have omitted until now. Upon their initial arrival in Ionia, Chaereas and Polycharmus chance on a temple of Aphrodite on Dionysius' estate and catch sight of the golden statue of Callirhoe, which he had placed as a dedication beside the goddess herself (*para tên theôn eikona Kallirhhoês chrusên, anathêma Dionusiou,* 3.6.3). In this phase of the plot, both lovers see only statues of one another – Callirhoe the portrait ring (*eikôn*) that supplies the model for the funeral statue she later makes of him and Chaereas the statue of his beloved in the temple.

This is a reasonable comparison in some respects. But there are also significant distinctions. Chaereas' image is recalled in a death-like context of dreams (reinforced by the use of Homeric quotations referring to the *eidôlon* of Patroclus, 2.9.6; cf. 4.1.3) and only later is it transformed into an actual funeral effigy for all to see.[14] Callirhoe's image, on the other hand, is a golden replica, equivalent to a cult statue of the divine and placed appropriately in a sacred place. Both figures are fashioned into images for public viewing, but one is a sign of mortality and the other of the world of the divine.[15]

[13] Auger (1983) 48.

[14] Dionysius' reference to Chaereas as a Protesilaos, when the latter makes his dramatic appearance (5.10.1) reinforces the idea of a return from the dead. See too Auger (1983) 48.

[15] Even more, although at the outset we are told that Callirhoe's "beauty was not so much human as divine, not that of a Nereid or mountain nymph, either, but of Aphrodite herself" (1.1.1), it is only when she crosses the sea to Ionia that she is fully mistaken for a goddess. Appropriately, she loses this attribution when she finally returns to Syracuse at the end, restored to her previous status as the wife of Chaereas.

Although, the mythic Helen is the figure especially shadowed behind Callirhoe,[16] the renown of her beauty turns her into a doublet of Aphrodite herself. If Helen too is poised ambivalently on border between mortal and divine status, and seems herself to be a hypostasis of Aphrodite, the depiction of Callirhoe and the erotic power she wields over others takes us much further into the thought world of Chariton's historical period.

This is the time when mortals may indeed be worshipped like gods, receive cult statues and extravagant homage. Rulers, of course, comprise the most important category in the Greco-Roman world, for whom statues of precious metals are not at all unknown. In this novel, the honor is reflected (anachronistically) in the status of the Great King, descendant of Helios, who is revered by his subject as a god, a *phanêros theos* (6.1.10; 6.7.12). At the same time, gods themselves are felt to be close enough to mortals to appear to them in dreams and visions and to manifest their presence to the faithful, especially in the vicinity or in the actual site of the sacred image.[17]

From the earliest times, the Greeks saw something divine in beauty.[18] The epithet 'like to a god' or a simile comparing a mortal to a specific divinity (especially, Apollo, Artemis, and Aphrodite) are poetic attributes familiar to us, from Homer on, used to describe someone whose body is graced with a special glamorous radiance, and these aspects are invoked, often in direct quotation, on numerous occasions in our text. The genre of the erotic novel takes full rhetorical advantage of the popular notion that beauty itself may be taken as evidence of divinity. The mere sight of it is a memorable visual experience bordering on epiphany, whether in the first reciprocal gaze of the lovers in Syracuse or for others, whether they be future rivals or merely spectators, who behold one or the other of the couple (usually the heroine) with wonderment and awe.[19] Chariton is not alone in providing such spectacles as public feasts for the eye (e.g., Xenophon of Ephesus and Heliodorus), but the degree of his rhetorical insis-

[16] See especially, LaPlace (1980) and also Biraud (1986). By the time of her reunion with Chaereas, Callirhoe will also be transformed into a Penelope (and he into Odysseus).
[17] See especially Lane Fox (1986) 102-67.
[18] See especially Jax (1933).
[19] For further textual citations, see Scott (1938). On the political connotations between divinity, especially Aphrodite, and the social elite and its function as a source of general civic unity, see also Perkins (1995) 52-5 and Edwards (1993).

tence on the sight of Callirhoe as something "supernatural, miraculous or divine" far outstrips any of the other extant romances and gives the work a scopic intensity that fully merges the sacred and the aesthetic under the omnipotent influence of Eros.

Everywhere Callirhoe goes, she dazzles all who gaze on her; sailors, country folk, entire cities – in Greece, Ionia, and Persia. Advance notice of her arrival draws out crowds to see her,[20] to strongest effect in Babylon.[21] The Persian court is indeed the most appropriate setting to showcase Callirhoe, for it is here that all three strands of extravagant homage can be combined: to royalty, to erotic beauty, and to divinity. Indeed, under the Empire it was not uncommon for women of ruling families to be depicted as Aphrodite or Venus.[22]

The notion that Callirhoe may be some goddess who has descended from heaven or arisen from the sea is a repetitive motif throughout the narrative. The opening lines of the novel introduce this daughter of the general, Hermocrates, as a "marvel of a girl" (*thaumaston ti chrêma parthenou*) and the *agalma* of all of Sicily. Her beauty was more than human (*ouk anthrôpinon*), it was divine (*theion*) neither of a Nereid or a mountain Nymph at that, but of Aphrodite herself (1.1). But it is only when she crosses the seas to Ionia that she truly becomes the 'living portrait' of Aphrodite, and this in two ways: as an apparent epiphany of the goddess to the onlookers and through her image as a cult statue. There is a certain zone of confusion between the two that is mediated through descriptions that recall famous works of art. Even in the earliest periods, there is no pressing need, when speaking of a divinity, to specify whether the god or the statue of the god is meant. By Chariton's time, the figuration of divinity takes on an even more prestigious role, especially

[20] When the citizens of Miletus see her in town for the mock funeral of Chaireas, she appears to them "with shining hair and bare arms, looking more beautiful than Homer's goddesses of white arms and fair ankles." Even more, no one present could endure the radiance (*marmarugê*) of her beauty. Some turned their eyes away, as if the sun's rays has fallen on them, and made obeisance (*proskunesis*, 4.1.9).

[21] Anticipation had run high, ever since the rumor had spread that she was to come, Callirhoe of the "celebrated name," the "great masterpiece of nature" (*to mega tês phuseôs kathorthôma*), "like Artemis or golden Aphrodite" (4.7.5). When she actually arrives, "everyone strained their eyes, indeed their very souls, almost falling over each other in their desire each to be the first to see and to get as close as possible" (5.3.8-9). Poor Dionysius had taken the precaution of curtaining the carriage to prevent any new dangers (eventually, to no avail).

[22] Scott (1938), with numerous textual references to Callirhoe's effect on her beholders. See too Aymard (1934).

when the image is one of the famed models of the past, such as those made by Pheidias and other renowned artists that have attained the status of ideal perfection. To dream of a god or the statue of a god is the same thing, declares Artemidorus (2.35, 37; 4.31), and if a statue, the communion between dreamer and statue is one way of animating it and bringing it to movement, speech, and life.[23] Chariton exploits this border crossing between epiphany and cult statue with both serious and ironic intent, and at the same time, profits from the well-known features of artistic masterpieces that would be recognized by the audience.[24]

Before Callirhoe even reaches that temple of Aphrodite in Ionia, preparations are made to highlight the overlapping between the beautiful woman, the goddess Aphrodite, and her aesthetic images. The first scene shows her in the deity's typical statuary pose at her bath, where the local women are suitably and predictably awestruck at the sight of her naked body: "Her skin gleamed white, sparkling just like some shining substance; her flesh was so soft that you were afraid even the touch of a finger would cause a bad wound" (2.2.2).

Richard Hunter suggests that the narrator may have had in mind Praxiteles' famous statue of Aphrodite on Knidos, representing the goddess just before her bath, which launched the long-lived career of this pose, not only in art but also in literary allusion, such as Lucian's *Erotes*.[25] Elsewhere in the text, there are other gestures toward well-known pictorial and statuary motifs, such as Nymphs and Nereids, as well as the popular motif of the sleeping Ariadne to whom Callirhoe

---

[23] Brillante (1988).

[24] Already the word *agalma* that was used to characterize Callirhoe at the outset of the novel bears an ambiguous charge. It may mean ornament or glory in a general sense or a cult statue in a more restricted one. We will have to wait until we reach the temple of Aphrodite close to Dionysius' estates in Ionia to get the full resonance of this term, but the cue to artistic portraiture as the touchstone of beauty is already encoded in the first description of Chaereas that follows immediately after the one of Callirhoe as the *agalma* of all of Sicily. He was surpassingly handsome, the text tells us, "like Achilles and Nireus and Hippolytus and Alcibiades as sculptors and painters portray them" (1.1.3).

[25] Hunter (1994) further points to the "motif of flesh that could be bruised as a *topos* of realistic art criticism (as in Herodas 4.59-62, for example, and Ovid's Pygmalion, *Met*. 10.256-8)." There may also be a *jeu de mots* on the word for 'shining substance' *marmarugê* behind which we hear *marmar* or marble. The same word recurs to describe bare-armed Callirhoe at the mock funeral, where we are also told that no one looked at the sculpted image of Chaereas in the ceremonies, because Callirhoe herself was there (4.1.10).

is several times compared.[26] Artemis with her hunters is another famous subject and the theme of Aphrodite rising from the waves (8.6.11) is best known from a famous painting by Apelles.

After her bath, Dionysius' servant suggests she go to "Aphrodite's shrine and pray. The goddess makes epiphany in these parts, and all come to make sacrifice to her." The local women seem to know what 'Aphrodite' looks like, and one of them declares: "when you look at Aphrodite [meaning now her statue], you'll think you are looking at an *eikôn* of yourself" (2.2.6). They are right. As soon as Dionysius enters the shrine where she has gone after experiencing a nocturnal vision of Aphrodite, he cries out "Aphrodite, be gracious to me. May your appearance be propitious" (2.3.6). The climactic moment of this interchange between mortal, goddess, and statue, however, occurs when Chaereas and Polycharmus wander into the temple. Chaereas had just prayed to Aphrodite to "give back the woman you granted me" when he catches sight of the golden statue, dedicated by Dionysius, standing right beside the goddess, and he collapses in a faint. The servant, reviving him, reassures him: "Take courage, the goddess has struck many others besides you. For she is *epiphanês* and shows herself *enargôs*" (3.6.3-4). Epiphany and statuary seem to amount to the same thing. The text here refuses to distinguish between the full divine presence of one (Aphrodite, 'in person' and in image) and mere representation or imitation (Callirhoe). Chaereas' collapse, as we know, was not occasioned by seeing an apparition of the goddess but rather by his viewing the portrait of his beloved, whom he will shortly discover is still alive. Still the confusion remains. When Callirhoe later enters the temple to weep over Chaereas' supposed death ('seen' in her dream), the priestess comforts her:

> Why are you crying, child, when you have such good fortune. Why, foreigners are actually worshipping you as a goddess now. The other day two handsome young men sailed by here, and one of them almost fainted when he gazed at your portrait (*eikôn*). You see how Aphrodite has made you a veritable apparition (*epiphanês*, 3.9.1).[27]

---

[26] See, for example, the discussion of Fredrick (1995) 273.

[27] On the other hand, Callirhoe's subsequent visit to the temple after she has had her child provokes an unusual tableau, where she herself provides a new iconographical model. "With her son in her arms, the most beautiful sight was seen (*ôphthê theama kalliston*) such as no painter ever painted nor sculptor modeled nor

It is Callirhoe's external appearance, of course, as she is seen through the eyes of others, that gives rise to ideas of divine epiphany, works of art, and the obsessive visions produced by the *phantasia* of an imaginative lover. She herself is far from mystified. She replies bitterly to Dionysius, when he first takes her for Aphrodite and then on learning of her identity still insists, with an apt quote from Homer, that "gods may take the shape of strangers from other lands." "Stop mocking me. Stop calling me a goddess – I' m not even a happy mortal" (2.3.7), and later, like her predecessor, Helen, she laments her "treacherous beauty" that has brought only calumny upon her (5.4.3-4).

Much more can (and should be) said on the intricacies of viewing throughout the work.[28] But to conclude. As the earliest extant example of a Greek romance, Chariton's work is an excellent witness to the expanded fortunes of the theater, theatricality, image making, and the rhetoric of vision, visuality, and iconicity in his period. Yet it also marks a transitional phase from the Hellenistic world to the later romances of the so-called Second Sophistic. In the temporal setting of its plot (the Sicilian defeat of Athens in the Peloponnesian war), it refers most closely to the classical era and by its various literary strategies (particularly, in its direct quotations of Homer and its allegiance to the Euripidean dramas, *Iphigenia in Tauris* and *Helen*), it is still explicit in advertising its dependency on its illustrious forebears. The same holds true, to some extent, in regard to those visual aspects enumerated above, which unlike the more elaborate and framed ekphrases, for example, of the later romances, are here fully integrated into the actions and attitudes of the characters themselves. They serve as organizing elements that sustain the work's technique of doubling and repetition or, in the case of dreams, as we have seen, they func-

---

poet recounted until now, since none of them has represented Artemis or Athena holding a baby in her arms" (*oute zôgraphos egrapsen oute plastês eplassen oute poiêtês historêse mechri nun*, 3.8.6). Perkins (1995) 70, relying on Muchow (1988) 87-8, remarks on this image as representing her chastity, even in the face of her new marriage and the birth of her child.

[28] In particular, the king's hunting expedition (6.4-7) deserves attention that limits of space preclude. With an ekphrasis of his costume in his efforts to be the object of her gaze and his subsequent visions of Callirhoe that intrude upon the supposed distraction of the hunt, this scene provides an intricate mosaic of reference: to myth (Artemis), epic (Homer), figural representation (whether in statuary, painting, or simile, all corresponding to the word *eikôn*), and, of course, the vivid quality of *phantasia* at work.

tion as imaginative signposts that clarify its structure and deepen its emotional valence. No other work of Greek prose fiction shows the range and extent of the calculated uses of images and imagery as does this one, and does so consistently with such psychological insight and depth of feeling.[29]

[29] This essay is part of a longer work in progress on vision, figuration, and image.

This page intentionally left blank

SPECTATOR AND SPECTACLE IN APULEIUS

Niall W. Slater

Peter Brook's production of *The Persecution and Assassination of Jean Paul Marat as Performed by the Inmates of the Asylum of Charenton under the Direction of the Marquis de Sade* remains legendary in modern theatrical history, not least for the staging of its ending. *Marat/Sade* is a play-within-a-play, performed by the inmates to entertain visitors, who considered the asylum just another amusement, such as going to the zoo. In Brook's original production prison bars all across the stage separated the inmates from their onstage audience, and therefore from the patrons out front as well. At play's end, however, the inmates swarmed up onto the bars, which then toppled out over the orchestra and released the performers into the thoroughly disconcerted audience. *Marat/Sade* was by no means the first production to rupture the proscenium bounds, but it was one of the most memorable.

Flash forward to a production of Goldoni's *The Venetian Twins* in London a few years ago. The RSC director staged an elaborate chase and sword duel all around the stage and through the audience as well. As the impressively acrobatic actors were climbing across the patrons in the third row, one of the actors appeared to stab an audience member accidentally. The director, thinking even this insufficient to startle an audience today, had instructed the actors to stop the action, had the stage manager come out still wearing her electronic headset for supervising the production, and brought in other actors costumed as police and ambulance crew – none of which even slightly disconcerted the audience, which laughed ceaselessly throughout the episode.

One final anecdote: recently I attended a local Atlanta production of *Cannibal! The Musical,* a cheery rendition of the story of Alfred E. Packer, the only U.S. citizen ever convicted of cannibalism, and for whom incidentally the University of Colorado Student Union named its lunch grill. Like other front-row patrons, I was warned that my day-of-performance seat was on the edge of the "spatter zone," but I was assured that the gore which sprayed occasionally into the

audience would wash out of anything it landed on, since it was made from sugar-free pink lemonade – and they were quite right.

These anecdotes remind us of the relative security of the modern spectator. However much the director and performers may wish to surprise or shock the audience, the paying patrons in the seats know that it is all in good fun and, if necessary, the management will even pay your cleaning bills. Many contemporary theories of the gaze, based as they are in the even more securely voyeuristic model of the cinema—the warm and safe dark room from which we look into the world of light—take this security of spectator and spectatorship for granted.

The ancient experience of viewing, and especially Roman viewing, was by no means so secure. Calpurnius's *Eclogue* 7 describes the barrier which kept wild animals in the amphitheatre from leaping up into the audience to find their lunch, rather than attacking the hunters or helpless victims on the amphitheatre floor.[1] More abstractly, Shadi Bartsch's *Actors in the Audience* explicates how the emperor's gaze could reverse the usual dialectic of power, turning his audience into performers struggling to preserve their own positions, even their own lives, in the violent dynamics of the early imperial age.[2] In a society as hierarchical as Rome's, the analysis can easily be extended down the social scale, as patrons and clients watch each other's performances with heightened vigilance.

A spectatorial and indeed, as the Romans understood it, theatrical paradigm underlies much of Apuleius's *Golden Ass*. Yet the participants' positions in these theatricalized encounters are rarely as stable as the modern reader may first assume: spectators may themselves become spectacle and vice versa. I suggest this instability is by no means merely random: throughout the novel there is an increasing slippage from the privileged position of spectator toward spectacle which ever more powerfully objectifies the narrator Lucius. In a reading of the novel which pays attention to the power of the spectator, Lucius's end as object of the gaze of Isis, an end that I have always found horrifying, does not come as a surprise but as the conclusion of a long process.

---

[1] Calpurnius *ecl.* 7.51-3: *et coit in rotulum, tereti qui lubricus axe / impositos subita vertigine falleret ungues, / excuteretque feras.*

[2] Bartsch (1994).

The Golden Ass's deep concern with seeing and being seen is well known. I seek here to explicate a pattern of visual allusions in the novel which, when historicized within Roman models of viewing and especially within the frame of the amphitheatre, suggests how our narrator gradually loses his position as spectator and becomes part of the spectacle designed and controlled by others. By inscribing the novel within a world of Roman spectators and spectacles we shall more clearly see how control of spectacle was indeed a matter of life and death.

The power of spectacle over life and death is amply illustrated by the Festival of Laughter in Book Three (2-12). At the end of Book Two Lucius returns home drunk from a party, finds three figures battering at the door of his host, whom he takes to be robbers, and stabs them all. Fotis lets him in, and the next morning he awakens, terrified that he will be arrested for killing the three. Soon a mob appears and hauls him off to the forum and then the theatre for trial. Here Lucius must not only face the public prosecutor but also two women dressed in mourning who rush into the theatre, carrying a child and appealing for justice. They purport to be mother, widow, and child of the murder victims. An unwilling Lucius is physically forced to uncover the bodies of his 'victims' – who turn out to be lacerated wineskins. As the audience rocks with laughter, the magistrates explain the Festival of Laughter to Lucius, then offer him honors in compensation for his travails.

I suggest that, via the first-person narration, we have experienced what it is like to 'star' in the 'fatal charades' of Kathleen Coleman's famous discussion.[3] Apart from the surprise happy ending, Lucius has played the criminal in an elaborate and potentially fatal judicial drama. He improvises to the best of his rhetorical abilities, but to no avail. Confronted with instruments of torture, he attempts to buy time by resisting the stage directions to uncover his victims' bodies—but is compelled by the lictors. Suddenly the tragedy turns into Atellan farce, Lucius escapes, and the performance seems to be over—although subsequent narration reveals what neither public nor Lucius yet know, the role of Pamphile's magic in the whole story.

The fundamental reversal of spectator and spectacle is clear from this narrative: the insatiably curious Lucius who came to Thessaly

[3] Coleman (1990).

seeking magic has become the show himself. This reversal anticipates that of the whole novel, as Lucius moves from curiosity seeker and observer of others to priest of Isis and the center of others' attention at the novel's end. Yet there are two key differences. After the Festival of Laughter, Lucius escapes from the spectacle back to his position as spectator. More abstractly, we also realize that Lucius has failed to interpret all the evidence available from the Festival. Jack Winkler's *Auctor & Actor* holds that the account of Lucius's experiences which he narrates in Books One through Ten and the account of those same experiences given by the priest of Isis to Lucius in Book Eleven are fundamentally incompatible.[4] This incompatibility invites re-reading. We search for the hidden clues and foreshadowings of Isis in that re-reading – but fail to find them. For Winkler, the meaning of the novel is forever poised between two incompatible views, between Lucius's own experiences as seen through his eyes and the meaning imposed on them by Isis, in ultimate undecidability.

This, however, is not true of Lucius's experience of the Festival of Laughter. Re-reading this briefer narrative, we see elements that Lucius misses in the turmoil – above all, the spectators' persistent laughter at him, which Lucius finds so alienating and inexplicable. After his arrest he marvels (*rem admirationis maximae*, 3.2) at the crowd's extreme laughter (*risu dirumperetur*), at their disregard for their own safety in their zeal to see (*miro ... studio*), and he is both amazed and appalled to spot his host Milo in the crowd laughing with the rest (*risu cachinnabili ... risu maximo*, 3.7). Even by the standards of that much crueler age, Lucius finds the degree of laughter which greets his misfortunes incomprehensible: it does not fit his story. Only when the Festival frame is revealed does the laughter make sense. The new paradigm accounts for evidence which the old paradigm, in which Lucius did believe himself to be a killer, could not account for. The new paradigm is indeed superior – even if it is not yet wholly accurate, for we still lack the information Fotis will supply about the role of Pamphile's magic in the story.

This shift justifies examining other elements of Lucius's experience as the star in this potentially fatal charade, for they may not all be what they seem, nor are their meanings fully exhausted in our initial encounters with them. The theatre setting underlines the theatri-

[4] Winkler (1985).

cality of Lucius's experience. His trial is about to begin in the forum, when the mob demands with one voice (*cuncti consona uoce flagitant*, 3.2)[5] that because of the crowding the trial be moved to the theatre. Perhaps only a highly suspicious reader will wonder over that detail of "one voice" on first reading – but on second reading, this sounds like something the crowd is prepared for, not a spontaneous decision. The Festival of Laughter does not really belong in the civic space of the forum but in the festival space of the theatre.

How would a Roman reader visualize this theatre? The term in Latin covers a range of structures, both what we label a theatre today and the smaller Roman performance spaces that modern archaeologists call odea, roofed theatres.[6] The latter may seem the more likely possibility, because the narrator reports the crowd is so great that it fills not only the entrances but the roof as well: *aditus etiam et tectum omne fartim stipauerant* (3.2). This is certainly a striking picture and evidence of some curious displacements within the theatre space. On a first reading one may be inclined to ascribe these displacements simply to the crowded conditions, but a more suspicious reading may be in order. For example, here is how Lucius describes his own entrance into the theatre space:

> *tunc me per proscaenium medium uelut quandam uictimam publica ministeria*[7] *producunt et orchestrae mediae sistunt.* (3.2)
>
> Then public officers led me like a sacrificial victim along the middle of the stage and stood me in the center of the orchestra.[8]

Obviously, the stage offers maximum visibility. The preposition *per* is a little ambiguous here: is Lucius led in from the side, as Hanson seems to imagine, to center stage, or does he enter through the central portal of the *scaenae frons*? Why then does he leave the stage itself and enter the orchestra? Remember that a Roman theatre's orchestra is not a place of performance, but a privileged seating area. There orchestra lacks permanent seats, however, and it here seems imagined as an empty space. Lucius is thus introduced as a performer but then

---

[5] Compare *consonaque civium voce* at 4.16, praising Demochares, giver of an amphitheatre show.

[6] Izenour (1992).

[7] Van der Paardt (1971) *ad loc.* notes that at Suetonius, *Nero* 12, *arenae ministeria* means "managers of the games." Does *ministeria* here have a gladiatorial ring as well?

[8] Unless otherwise noted, text and translation are from Hanson (1989).

positioned in an ambiguous space, neither on stage nor with the audience in the *cavea*, but somewhere in between. His fate is not yet decided.

Nor is the space of the spectators clearly delimited. The thronging crowd has converted almost any available space to its own use. Here again is Lucius's description:

> *plerique columnis implexi, alii statuis dependuli, nonnulli per fenestras et lacunaria semiconspicui.* (3.2)
>
> Several wrapped themselves round the columns, others hung from the statues, and some were half-visible through the windows and under the cornices.

Columns might appear at several points in a theatre, but statues and cornices[9] most likely belong on the *scaenae frons* itself, along with numerous columns. Also, if this is an open-air theatre, not an odeon, the roof could just cover the stage, supported on cornices. There is good evidence for reconstructing such a stage roof for the Odeon of Herodes Atticus in Athens and for other later theatres.[10] The picture we are discerning here is very curious. The upper levels of the *scaenae frons* were not, to our knowledge, normally performance spaces. Decorative statues filled the various niches, rather than actors. Nonetheless the *scaenae frons* was a form of permanent scenery and therefore part of the performance. Is this curious detail of spectators hanging from the scenery in their desire to see—and laugh at—Lucius a way for Apuleius to hint that they are performing themselves?

And finally we must consider Lucius's own understanding of what is happening to him. He uses two frames of reference for under-

[9] I have translated *lacunaria* here as "cornices," which would indeed be on the *scaenae frons*, but "decorative ceiling panels" is also a possibility. The *OLD* gives separate entries for the words *lacunar* and *lacunaria*, but the second entry exists only to account for a second declension genitive plural form in Vitruvius for a word which otherwise seems only to be third declension. That form is the one citation where the panels are "on the underside of a cornice." My thanks to an anonymous referee for clarifying this. All the *OLD* citations come from Vitruvius. If *lacunaria* does mean decorative ceiling panels here, it would harmonize with the earlier reference to the crowds filling up the roof (*tectum*, rendered as "roof" by Jack Lindsay and Robert Graves, although P.G. Walsh rather curiously translates "the concourse at the top"). Decorative panels lightened a ceiling's weight and were removable, so some of the audience may have climbed out onto the gridwork to look down through these openings.

[10] Bieber (1961) illustrates a marble relief showing such a stage roof (fig. 634); cf. also her reconstructions of the theatre at Aspendus (fig. 705), a cornice there (fig. 706), and Fiechter's reconstruction of the Odeon of Herodes Atticus (fig. 715).

standing his position as events unfold, and both are more accurate than he himself realizes. In neither case does he later reflect on his experience, but re-reading invites us to do so. First, a ritual frame: Lucius twice compares himself to the victim in an animal sacrifice. After his arrest he is paraded through the streets to the forum:

> *tandem pererratis plateis omnibus, et in modum eorum quibus lustralibus piamentis minas portentorum hostiis circumforaneis expiant circumductus angulatim, forum eiusque tribunal astituor* (3.2).
>
> Finally, after we had wandered through every street and I had been led around into every corner—like those purificatory processions when they carry sacrificial animals all round the town to expiate threatening portents—I was brought into the forum and stationed in front of the tribunal.

Here he is a *hostia*, then on the theatre proscaenium a *victima*. Lucius is quite right: he is the sacrificial victim making the Festival of Laughter possible. Perhaps what saves him is his resistance. In Greek sacrificial rite the animal had to be made to appear to consent to the sacrifice, and various techniques created this appearance. Lucius is entirely unwilling, however, and must be forced by the lictors to uncover the bodies.[11]

The second is a visual or artistic frame. After the revelation, when Lucius discovers the dead robbers are merely wineskins, he compares himself to stone, and not just any stone but, as Van der Paardt notes,[12] the *other* statues and columns of the theatre itself:

> *at ego ut primum illam laciniam prenderam, fixus in lapidem steti gelidus nihil secus quam una de ceteris theatri statuis uel columnis. nec prius ab inferis emersi quam Milon hospes accessit...* (3.10).
>
> As for me, from the moment I had pulled back that cloth I stood stock still, frozen into stone just like one of the other statues or columns in the theatre. And I did not rise from the dead until my host Milo came up to me ...

---

[11] Already noticed by McCreight (1993) 47-8, who suggests that Lucius's fearful posture sitting up in bed that morning paints him as a bound and therefore ill-omened victim: Lucius sits with his feet and fingers tightly interlaced (*complicitis ... pedibus ac palmulis ... connexis*, 3.1).

[12] Van der Paardt (1971) *ad loc.* Van der Paardt also defends the transmitted *graculari* (3.10; Hanson prints *gratulari*), insisting that the latter would have to mean "congratulated [me]," though he notes that this could imply that the audience members see Lucius here as an actor performing.

To be a stone, even a statue, is death, from which Milo, heretofore not particularly kindhearted toward his guest, must rescue him. Milo even takes care to lead Lucius home along unpopulated streets, avoiding the gaze of the laughing crowds.

Lucius's moment in the spotlight is not yet quite over. The city magistrates pursue him home and there make a startling offer of compensation for his sufferings:

> *at tibi ciuitas omnis pro ista gratia honores egregios obtulit; nam et patronum scripsit et ut in aere staret imago tua decreuit.* (3.11)

> And the city has unanimously offered you special honors in gratitude for what you have done. It has inscribed you as its patron and decreed that your likeness be preserved in bronze.

In other words, they wish to immortalize his embarrassment and make of his starring role in the Festival of Laughter a monument at least as lasting as bronze.

Lucius feigns (*refingens*, 3.12) a more cheerful and modest response than he actually feels to this offer, but he does firmly decline to become a statue:

> *uerum statuas et imagines dignioribus meique maioribus reseruare suadeo.* (3.11) "But I urge you to reserve statues and portraits for worthier and greater men than I."

The reference here is brief, but it echoes what was surely a familiar topos. In a pattern established by Augustus and still attested under Marcus Aurelius, the emperors were regularly offered excessive honors, including temples and statues in gold and silver, which they as regularly declined in favor of more modest statues in bronze.[13] Private individuals must have employed similar formulations in declining honors as Lucius does here, although they could accept such statues as well: Apuleius himself was given a statue in Carthage, and he alludes to other statues in his honor in his words of thanks.[14] Lucius,

---

[13] I am most grateful to C. Brian Rose for calling my attention to this body of material, mostly accessible in Oliver (1989). Note, for example, Oliver's #23 (Claudius declining a temple in his honor), #39 (an unnamed emperor, possibly Nero, declining both a temple and a crown), and #196 (Marcus Aurelius declining gold and silver statues in favor of bronze). Caracalla declines a title better reserved for Artemis, while citing his own modesty: Oliver (1989) #266: κατὰ τὴν ἐμὴν αἰδῶ (line 21). Cf. Scott (1931).

[14] While thanking Aemilianus Strabo, instigator of the statues, Apuleius deftly notes that Strabo cited *other* statues and honors already granted to him in his proposal: *alibi gentium et civitatium honores mihi statuarum et alios decretos* (*Florida*

however, is not just being modest. Here he resists not just embarrassment in general, but inscenation: he declines representation and therefore permanent designation as the starring victim of a script created by others.

His escape is not easy or complete: he is still pursued by the ravenous gaze of the crowds when Milo drags him out to the baths, in accord with a previous commitment. It is surely no accident that Apuleius makes this an expedition to the baths, where Lucius must strip himself naked before the gaze of some of the same crowd that saw him in the theatre. This is not merely modern psychologizing: as studies of the mosaic decorations in Roman baths have shown, the Romans felt vulnerable to the gaze and in particular the evil eye in the situation of the baths, and took steps to dispel such a dangerous gaze:[15]

> *at ego uitans oculos omnium, et quem ipse fabricaueram risum obuiorum declinans, lateri eius adambulabam obtectus ... sic omnium oculis nutibus ac denique manibus denotatus impos animi stupebam*. (3.12)
>
> To avoid everyone's stares and escape the laughter of the people we passed—laughter which I myself had manufactured—I walked close to his side, trying to conceal myself. [...] I was out of my mind, stunned from the branding of everyone's stares and nods and pointed fingers.

Hanson's translation of *denotatus* as "branding" is by no means too strong: the crowd's gaze of recognition marks him out as effectively as the brands on the faces of runaway slaves.[16] He feels the crowd's gaze as something imprisoning him in the role of victim, and in a sense only his transformation into the ass rescues him from such a gaze – at least temporarily.

Lucius is an initially unwitting and always unwilling participant in the potentially fatal charade of the Festival of Laughter. At the beginning of the novel therefore Lucius clearly recognizes the dangers of the public gaze and consistently seeks to escape from it. No fame, not even a statue in his honor, is worth the danger of being spectacle rather than spectator.

16.37); see Hunink (2001) 167. *Anth. Pal.* 2.303 indicates another statue erected to Apuleius in Byzantium. The closest parallel I have found for a private individual is L. Vaccius Labeo's refusal of a temple and gold statues in his honor, recorded in *CIG* 2, 3524, and discussed in Charlesworth (1939) 5-6.

[15] See Clarke (1998) 129-33.

[16] Cf. Petronius *Sat.* 103, where Eumolpus fakes brands on the faces of Encolpius and Giton to disguise them as runaway slaves.

Once transformed into the ass, Lucius encounters others in the novel who think they can risk an audience's gaze, yet control it through their own manipulation of the spectacle. Some of these incidents also draw on the scenarios and dynamics of the amphitheatre's 'fatal charades.' The robber Thrasyleon becomes another would-be performer in the amphitheatre. Lucius hears his story, one of the most spectacular and bizarre in the novel, in the robbers' cave. Thrasyleon and some companions were in Plataeae, where a wealthy man, Demochares,[17] has been preparing to give a gladiatorial show with wild beast fights:

> *gladiatores isti famosae manus, uenatores illi probatae pernicitatis, alibi noxii perdita securitate suis epulis bestiarum saginas instruentes. ... qui praeterea numerus, quae facies ferarum! nam praecipuo studio foris etiam aduexerat generosa illa damnatorum capitum funera. sed praeter ceteram speciosi muneris supellectilem totis utcumque patrimonii uiribus immanis ursae comparabat numerum copiosum.* (4.13)
>
> There were gladiators of renowned strength, animal-hunters of proven agility, and criminals, too, without hope of reprieve, who were to provide a banquet of themselves to fatten the beasts. ... And oh the quantity and fine appearance of the wild beasts! For he had taken great pains and had even imported from abroad these noble sepulchres for the condemned men. Beside the other furnishings for this showy spectacle, he employed the total resources of his inheritance to collect a large band of enormous bears.

The stage is explicitly set for fatal performances, but the first-time reader cannot fully appreciate the irony of describing the wild beasts as "noble sepulchres for the condemned men." The bears are in fact expiring in the streets from the summer heat, and their bodies are stolen for food by the starving poor – including our robbers. Thrasyleon has an additional idea, however: to use the bear's head and hide as a costume to gain admission to Demochares' house. Thrasyleon himself is one of several volunteers for the role,[18] and his

---

[17] *GCA* (1977) *ad* 4.13 notes the significance of Demochares' name ("People-pleaser").

[18] *ad munus obeundum* (4.15). Hanson translates this "to volunteer for the post," a perfectly plausible interpretation on first reading, given other military imagery in the passage (cf. *munus obire* in Livy 3.6.9). On second reading, however, the sense of "gladiatorial game" for *munus* may seem more likely. So too *ancipitis machinae subiuit aleam*, which Hanson translates as "undertook the hazard of this dangerous stratagem"; *machina* also has associations with amphitheatre performances.

comrades choose him to play what we might call the Trojan Bear.[19] The robbers present Thrasyleon, sewed into his bearskin and placed in a cage, to Demochares along with a forged letter proclaiming him a gift from a friend. They carefully warn Demochares not to put the new bear in with any of his other wild animals, ostensibly for fear of contagion, since so many have already died.[20] The plan is for Thrasyleon to slip out of his cage at night and let his comrades in from outside to plunder the house.

The robbers withdraw to a tomb outside the city gates to get some sleep, though not before they open some of the niches *quis inhabitabant puluerei et iam cinerosi mortui* (4.18), which they plan to use to store their booty. The imagery of the living inhabiting the usual space of the dead foreshadows Thrasyleon's coming adventures.

The first steps of the plan succeed, and they deposit one load of gold and silver at the tomb before returning for more. Then the scenario spins out of Thrasyleon's control. The robbers hoped that the sight of the bear running free would frighten any of the house's inhabitants into remaining in their rooms. Instead, a resourceful slave organizes a party to attack the bear and turns hunting dogs loose on him as well. The result is the invocation of at least two further performative frames, both of them dire news for Thrasyleon: he has now become the star in an amphitheatre-style wild beast hunt (a *venatio*) and simultaneously the criminal thrown to the wild beasts (*objectio ad bestias*).[21] Nonetheless, Thrasyleon valiantly struggles to remain

---

[19] I think calling this the "Trojan Bear" is not merely my joke but reflects a subtle theme in the imagery of birth and death in Thrasyleon's story. It is significant that Demochares has collected a large group of *female* bears (*ursae*, 4.13, reemphasized by the following feminine participles *captas... partas... oblatas*). *GCA* (1977) suggest Apuleius specifies gender because female bears are larger than the males, but Apuleius may be planning ahead for another point as well. Like the Trojan Horse, the female bear (*unam*, 4. 14, reminds us of her gender) is pregnant with death. The noun *ursa* (as opposed to feminine substantive adjectives and participles) then disappears after 4. 13 for much of the story; the bear is mostly called a *bestia* until 4. 21, when Thrasyleon is finally killed by spear thrusts through the heart (*ursae praecordiis*); here *GCA* (1977) note the emphasis placed on the word *ursae* by hyperbaton. Thrasyleon's body is left to lie until morning when it is discovered, as it were, by Caesarean section: *utero bestiae resecto ursae*.

[20] Obviously, though, the real danger would be that these animals might sniff Thrasyleon out under his borrowed skin and turn on him!

[21] These elements of amphitheatre performance have been illuminated by Frangoulidis (1999). Frangoulidis emphasizes the framing of the tale as a narrative told by a surviving comrade of Thrasyleon and thus a memorial to him, indeed a gladiatorial combat in his honor, also substituting for the planned games of Demochares.

in character and in control of his own scenario while desperately seeking to save his own life:

> *scaenam denique, quam sponte sumpserat, cum anima retinens nunc fugiens, nunc resistens uariis corporis sui schemis*[22] *ac motibus tandem domo prolapsus est.* (4.20)
>
> As long as he hung onto life, he hung onto the role he had volunteered to play. Sometimes retreating, sometimes making a stand, varying the postures and movements of his body, he finally slipped out of the house.

He does not get very far before the dogs bring him down, but still he remains in his role, continuing "to growl and roar like an animal" (*obnixo mugitu et ferino fremitu*, 4.21) until finished off by several spear thrusts. The bearskin has indeed become a sepulchre for the self-condemned Thrasyleon.

Despite some obvious similarities between his own and Thrasyleon's situations, it seems unlikely that this story is meant as a warning to Lucius about yielding to his curiosity or ambition – as for example the Diana and Actaeon sculpture group does when Lucius encounters it in Book Two, before his transformation. In Book Four, he is already an ass when he hears the story, and Lucius cannot simply climb out of his skin as Thrasyleon could or even use human speech to appeal for help. Is Thrasyleon's story then simply meant to mock Lucius's misfortunes and foreshadow further maltreatment? I think there must be more. The story functions as a warning against ambitious role-playing, against the overweening belief that one performer can safely control the scenario around him. Recall, for example, the staging of Afranius's play *Incendium* under Nero, in which the stage building was in fact set on fire. The actors were told they could keep any valuables they could rescue from the flames. We know no more than this – but they were performers who risked burning to death for the sake of gain. They may have succeeded: Thrasyleon did not.

If Thrasyleon is a warning to Lucius, he once again fails to take heed. A final allusion to a known scenario of the 'fatal charades' is

---

While I acknowledge the sophisticated play on narrative frames Frangoulidis has discerned, a third frame of Thrasyleon as a gladiator is the least clear (*pace* also Habinek [1990] 64-5). Thrasyleon cannot escape his self-assumed animal role to fight freely as a gladiator.

[22] See *GCA* (1977) *ad loc.* for the theatrical associations of *schemis*.

much briefer but no less telling in its context. Eventually the robbers grow tired of Lucius's unwillingness to be a useful beast of burden, and he hears them plotting to dump him over a cliff. He decides to take matters into his own hooves and attempts to escape when only the old woman and Charite are present.

> *quae uocis excitu procurrens uidet hercules memorandi spectaculi scaenam, non tauro, sed asino dependentem Dirce aniculam, sumptaque constantia uirili facinus audet pulcherrimum. extorto etenim loro manibus eius me placidis gannitibus ab impetu reuocatum nauiter inscendit et sic ad cursum rursum incitat*. (6.27)

> [Charite] ran out in response to the cries and saw before her, by Hercules, a scene from a memorable show: an aged Dirce dangling from an ass instead of a bull. The girl summoned up a man's courage and performed a bold and beautiful feat: she twisted the strap out of the old woman's hands, recalled me from my headlong flight with coaxing chatter, nimbly mounted my back, and then spurred me to a gallop once more.

In Greek myth Dirce was punished by being tied to a bull and dragged to death.[23] The theme was popular in Roman art, but we also find it as a punishment for women in the amphitheatre. Charite thus hijacks a fatal scenario and attempts to turn it into her own work of art. The revised scenario is fatal for the old woman, who, knowing the nature of her bandit employers, hangs herself in anticipation of their return, meeting a less graphic but no less effective end than Dirce. Charite on the other hand at first sees herself as the beneficiary of divine providence, embodied in Lucius, and as they gallop away promises him all sorts of creature comforts but also, once again, artistic immortality:

> *nam memoriam praesentis fortunae meae diuinaeque prouidentiae perpetua testatione signabo et depictam in tabula fugae praesentis imaginem*[24] *meae domus atrio dedicabo.* (6.29)

> I will put a seal on the memory of my present fortune and of divine providence by giving lasting testimony, and I will have a panel painted with the picture of our present escape and enshrine it in the entrance hall of my home.

---

[23] See *GCA* (1977) *ad loc.* for literary treatments of Dirce's story, Leach (1986) for visual treatments.

[24] *GCA* (1977) *ad loc.*, like Hanson, assumes a painted picture, although *imaginem* here might mean a relief sculpture.

Then she begins to fantasize about her own role and ranks her escape with tales of the mythic past, no less notable than Arion on the dolphin or Europa on the bull, and even as a proof for the present age that wonders are possible (6.29). Unfortunately she fails to heed the details of her own examples: the dolphin who rescued Arion and the bull carrying off Europa knew what they were doing. So does Lucius: he tries to carry her to safety by one path, knowing the robbers are returning by the other, but Charite resists, and as they struggle, the robbers recapture them. Ultimately she and Lucius will require the theatrical wiles of her bridegroom to rescue them.

While others' experience offers a variety of models for spectator and spectacle, Lucius gradually loses the awareness he has at the novel's beginning of the perilousness of his spectatorial position and thus surrenders himself to roles created by others – and ultimately to the role Isis offers. The Festival of Laughter gives Lucius a clear idea of the dangers of being spectacle rather than spectator. At the end of the same book, watching Pamphile transform herself into a bird, he describes his experience in words which clearly show the threat to his own identity which even watching such magic entails:

> *ego nullo decantatus carmine, praesentis tantum facti stupore defixus quiduis aliud magis uidebar esse quam Lucius: sic exterminatus animi, attonitus in amentiam uigilans somniabar* (3.22)
>
> I, who had not been enchanted by any spell, yet was so transfixed with awe at the occurrence that I seemed to be something other than Lucius. I was outside the limits of my own mind, amazed to the point of madness, dreaming while awake.

Yet his desire to become the performer of magic transformations himself, and thus to be the spectacle, rather than just witness it, is only increased by his experience – with the results we all know.

Transformed into an ass, Lucius undergoes many hardships, but even as the fates of those around him grow crueler and more violent, he seems to think himself more and more secure in his asinine form, as though he can remain a spectator of other's sufferings, even at times a malicious participant (as when he treads on the fingers of the adulterer under the tub in 9.27), without betraying or endangering himself.[25] He is, of course, wrong. When in Book Ten he begins to

[25] A typical expression of his view is this (9.13): *ingenita mihi curiositate recreabar, dum praesentiam meam parui facientes libere quae uolunt omnes et agunt et lo-*

eat human food in the house of the baker and cook, he becomes unambiguously the center of a spectacle. Where in Book Three he clearly recognized the danger of the laughter of the spectators, here he is deaf to the dangers.

> *et hora consueta uelut balneas petituri, clausis ex more foribus, per quandam modicam cauernam rimantur me passim expositis epulis inhaerentem. nec ulla cura iam damni sui habita, mirati monstruosas asini delicias risu maximo dirumpuntur, uocatoque uno et altero ac dein pluribus conseruis, demonstrant infandam memoratu hebetis iumenti gulam. tantus denique ac tam liberalis cachinnus cunctos inuaserat ut ad aures quoque praetereuntis perueniret domini*. (10.15)
>
> At their customary hour they locked the door as usual, as if they were going to the baths, and spied on me through a small crack. When they saw me tucking into the banquet which was spread all about, they forgot all concern over their losses and, in their amazement at this monstrous taste in an ass, they split their sides laughing. They called a couple of fellow-servants, and then several more, to show them, the unspeakable gluttony of a lazy ass. They were all attacked by such loud and unrestrained laughter that the sound even reached their master's ears as he was passing nearby.

Once again, the spectators dissolve in laughter, laughter so powerful that it summons the master, and that sets in motion the chain of events which inevitably leads from Lucius entertaining at parties to entertaining the libidinous matron to his proposed starring role in the amphitheatre as the sexual partner of the condemned adulteress and murderess.[26]

As the amphitheatre spectacle unfolds in Book Ten, Lucius at first happily enjoys his role as spectator. Only at the very end does he realize that, if the wild beasts are turned loose on the condemned woman before he finishes his performance with her, he may himself wind up on the menu with her. For one last time acutely aware of the dangers of appearing in a performance that he cannot control, Lucius seizes an opportunity while others are engrossed in the show ("all the slaves ... were busy, some spellbound by the sensual pleasure of the show," *tota familia ... occupata, partim uoluptario spectaculo adtonita*, 10.35) and escapes from the amphitheatre to the seashore.

---

quuntur. "I was revived by my innate curiosity, since everyone now took little account of my presence and freely did and said whatever they wished."

[26] *GCA* (2000) discusses this development in several notes on 10.15.

Book Eleven translates the dialectic of seeing and being seen from the civil and judicial realm emphasized in the first part of the novel to a religious realm. Under orders from Isis, Lucius finds her procession and the priest carrying roses, which Lucius eats in order to regain his human form. Lucius thus voluntarily joins a spectacle, and the result is not punishment but, apparently, salvation. Yet it is salvation bought at the cost of becoming permanently part of the show. Others have suggested before that there is a criticism implicit in the multiple initiations and expense required of Lucius, but whether this is satire of religious cult or straightforward reportage of Isiac practice, the drawn-out process emphasizes both the rehearsal and the costuming necessary to enable Lucius to play his new role successfully. He sells his clothes to pay for one initiation (11.28), thus casting off his former costume for the new one, and learns that he requires a third initiation for the explicit reason that his previous robes remain behind in Corinth (11.29). I have discussed at length elsewhere what seems particularly threatening about the scene in 11.24, where Lucius stands in front of Isis's statue (*ante deae simulacrum*), thus becoming part of a sculpture group with her.[27] The fate of becoming a statue, which he strove to avoid at the Festival of Laughter and accidentally escapes through Charite's untimely death, here finally overtakes him.

Lucius begins as an eager spectator and ends as spectacle. This progression may not alone determine the tone or meaning of the novel. In combination, however, with the allusions to, and depiction of, amphitheatre spectacle in the novel and specifically the echoes of various "fatal charades," this progression seems more terrifying than comforting. At novel's end Lucius rejoices to encounter the gaze of the crowds in his new role as lawyer and Isiac priest, but the resultant spectacle resembles nothing so much as that memorable description of the beasts in Demochares' show: *generosa illa damnatorum capitum funera*, "noble sepulchres for the condemned men."[28]

---

[27] Slater (1998) 39-40.

[28] I am very grateful to the audience at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, and in particular Stephen Harrison, who responded to an earlier version of this paper, for a number of valuable suggestions, and naturally to the audience at ICAN 2000 as well.

PLATO'S DREAM: PHILOSOPHY AND FICTION IN THE *THEAETETUS*

Kathryn Morgan

> "He's dreaming now," said Tweedledee: "And what do you think he's dreaming about?" Alice said. "Nobody can guess that." "Why, about *you*!" Tweedledee exclaimed, clapping his hands triumphantly. "And if he left off dreaming about you, where do you suppose you'd be?" "Where I am now, of course," said Alice. "Not you!" Tweedledee retorted contemptuously. "You'd be nowhere. Why, you're only a sort of thing in his dream!" ... "Well, it's no use *your* talking about waking him," said Tweedledum, "when you're only one of the things in his dream. You know very well you're not real."
>
> Lewis Carroll, *Through the Looking Glass*

The question of whether and how consciously Plato practices fiction has generated diverse answers. Christopher Gill, after writing a suggestive article claiming that Plato's Atlantis myth in the *Timaeus* and *Critias* was an early experiment in fiction, later sang a modified palinode. Although Plato clearly engages in what we would call 'fictionalising,' and works with distinctions that could easily lend themselves to our modern conceptions of fiction, he would, if pressed, nevertheless describe his own practice in terms of the distinction between truth and falsehood.[1] I concur with the general point: Platonic dialogues are not records of historical conversations. They are fictions, albeit quasi-historical fictions. Yet neither in the *Republic*, nor in the *Sophist*, where there is some discussion of talks about imitation and image-making, is there any detail about the good kind of image making and how it might apply to Plato's own images of philosophical conversation. We might say, to use his own words, that they are false, but have some truth in them – a form of serious play. There is, then, a troubling gap between Plato's practice and any explicit theorising of it. While this would not trouble us in the case of an author in the tradition of the novel, it does disturb in the case of a philosopher concerned to draw with precision the line between true and false.

[1] Gill (1993) (cf. Gill [1979]).

A proper examination of this nexus of problems is beyond my present scope. Yet it is possible to use Platonic practice to shed light on the origins of the self-conscious practice of fiction. I propose to use Plato's *Theaetetus* as an abbreviated case study. I shall focus first on the unsettling role of the prologue conversation between Euclides and Terpsion, and on the extent to which it should be taken as a model for Plato's own practice. I shall then examine the importance of the idea of dreaming in the dialogue, and will suggest that dreaming be seen as an analogue for the experience of fiction. This in turn underscores the fact that any account of fiction would be implicated in Platonic metaphysics. Finally, I shall look at how the construction of fictional interlocutors in the dialogue can give us some guidance about the rules of the game in philosophic fiction.

The Prologue

In the *Theaetetus* prologue, Euclides and Terpsion meet in Megara. Euclides has just seen a fatally wounded Theaetetus being taken home to Athens and is reminded of a conversation Theaetetus had with Socrates when he was young. Socrates had told him of this conversation, and Euclides had written it down, going back several times to Socrates with questions until he got it right. Euclides and Terpsion decide to spend some time listening to the conversation and they go home, where Euclides' slave reads it aloud to them. Before he starts, Euclides explains his narrative method: "This is the way I wrote the discourse: I didn't write Socrates narrating it as he narrated it to me, but in conversation with those with whom he conversed. He said it was with the geometer Theodorus and Theaetetus. Therefore, so that the narratives between the speeches shouldn't cause trouble whenever Socrates said about himself, for example, 'And I declared' and 'And I said,' or again, with respect to the respondent that 'He agreed' or 'He disagreed' – because of this I have written it as him speaking to them, removing such things." Terpsion replies, "That's nothing unreasonable" (143b5-c7).

The use of a framing narrative or conversation is not infrequent in Plato, although it is by no means standard practice. We are reminded of the beginning of the *Symposium*, with its elaborate series of nested narratives establishing the literary pedigree and trustworthiness of the account, although in the *Symposium* we start in mid-conversation and

never resort to a written text, whereas the *Theaetetus* shows us Euclides and Terpsion meeting and subsequently having Socrates' conversation read to them. These elaborate efforts to create a narrative pedigree may, depending upon our predisposition, reassure us (if we were to believe that the dialogue is a transcript) or, as David Halperin suggests, make us all the more aware of the fact that this account is constructed (I shall return to the implications of this).[2] We can observe, however, that in this world of narrative method, authority is important.[3] The interlocutors want to be true to the original conversation (although this does not commit us to thinking that such a conversation actually took place). But whereas the *Symposium* launches into the body of the dialogue with a turn to indirect discourse, as the oral report of an oral report, the *Theaetetus* simply restarts with direct discourse. "Boy, take the book and read," says Euclides, and the next thing we hear is Socrates' voice in the mouth of the slave boy (or our slave boy, or our own voice). The narrating frame has been removed, and we never return to it, even at the end of the dialogue.

The focus of the frame on the Socratic conversation as a written text is unique in the Platonic corpus. This stress on textuality makes us want to explore whether the narratology of the frame is programmatic for Plato.[4] The uniqueness of the frame suggests to me that it has been designed by Plato to highlight the main issues involved: what authority lies behind the production of a Socratic discourse, and what status should we as readers assign to it.[5] I find support for this contention in the interesting fact that two versions of the opening of the *Theaetetus* circulated in antiquity. The anonymous middle Platonist commentator on the dialogue remarks that an alternate beginning started with the words, "Boy, are you bringing the *logos* about Theaetetus?" (Col. 3.33-4). This has sometimes been interpreted to mean that a new prologue was written for the dialogue after the death

[2] Halperin (1992) 97-9, Johnson (1998) 590. As Feeney (1993) 238 remarks, any authenticating device may also "become a device of alienation."

[3] Thus, e.g., Johnson (1998) 581-2, 585.

[4] Johnson (1998) 586.

[5] Rorty (1972) 228 comments, "It is as if we, the readers, had, through Euclides' recapturing Socrates' words, become witnesses to the whole conversation. Whether we are then entitled to claim that we know what happened becomes a question to be investigated."

of Theaetetus, in order to honour him.[6] Thesleff hypothesizes that the alternate beginning is merely an early version of the current prologue and reconstructs an even earlier version in which there was a Socratic frame dialogue, probably between Socrates and Euclides.[7] Whatever the truth concerning the history of the text, the crucial point for my current purposes is that unless (with Thesleff) we believe that the current frame is spurious, both versions suggest that the prologue has been written by Plato to foreground the issue of the authority behind and textuality of this dialogue. Even the alternate ending presupposes the existence of a written text read out to Euclides. As we shall see, the issue of the authority we allow to a text and the nature of our belief in it is parallel to a problem that informs the entire dialogue: what authority we should ascribe to our perceptions.

None of these second order issues seem to be of interest to Euclides, who declares that he has removed the interruptions characteristic of a narrator because such things make trouble. Trouble for whom and of what sort. For him as writer? Or because it distances the audience from the emotional impact of the discussion? We note that Euclides never canvasses the possibility that he report Socrates' narrative in a form of indirect discourse such that he would report Socrates' narrative. He has considered that he might have written "And I [Socrates] declared that ..." but never "And he [Socrates] declared that ... ." For Euclides, at least, Socrates himself is proof against transformation into the third person. Nor has Terpsion any objection to this: "That's nothing unreasonable" (or "out of the way") he replies (143c7). The response conjures up thoughts of dramatic Platonic dialogues (without frames) but also of dialogues where Socrates acts as frame narrator. The beginning of the internal dialogue in the *Theaetetus*, where Socrates asks Theodorus for news about promising young men, recalls the opening of the *Charmides*, where Socrates, this time relating his experiences in the first person, asks Critias the same question. Socrates' narration in the *Charmides* is precisely the narrative format we would have encountered in the *Theaetetus* if Euclides had not removed the narratorial comments.

[6] Bastianini, Sedley (1995) 268, 486 (with discussion and bibliography).

[7] Thesleff (1982) 61, 153 with n. 130, 183. In fact, Thesleff believes (181) that the current frame was not written by the same person who wrote the rest of the dialogue.

Nor was Plato the only author of Socratic discourses. The historical Euclides is known to have written six, and there were others.[8] Our evidence is scanty, but it indicates that many Socratic writers used the reported dialogue form.[9] Euclides in the *Theaetetus* performs the part of an author of *Sokratikoi logoi*. He is the author of a written text based upon living interaction with Socrates and inhabits a world of purported accurate and veridical reporting. Moreover, he makes his practice explicit. The fact that Euclides has laid his narrative cards on the table is meant to make them more acceptable. He has shown us his pedigree and has explained, however sketchily, his method, instituted in the cause of vividness and immediacy. There is no evidence that such an account of method occurred in the writings of any writer of Socratic discourses, nor, as I have noted, does Plato give us such an account. Indeed, a survey of the anachronisms and fantastic elements in *Sokratikoi logoi* (including Platonic ones) has lead Charles Kahn to emphasise that the essential fictiveness of the genre may well have been taken for granted by its first readers.[10]

If this is the case, why does Plato have Euclides make such efforts to justify his narratology? Euclides' own explanation impresses neither me nor the anonymous middle Platonist commentator, who notes that insertions such as "he said" or "I replied" do not disturb us elsewhere in the corpus (col. IV.6-17).[11] Unfortunately, the commentator has nothing detailed to say about the significance of the narrative strategy, although he does seem to grant the importance of the activity of the prologue as a moral paradigm. I conclude that one important reason for the focus on narrative method is to raise the deeper issue of the kind of belief we assign to fictional narratives. We are not merely to take the fictiveness of the dialogue for granted, but must problematise it. We are encouraged to do so because of the complex relationship between the Euclidean and the Platonic narrator. Euclides tells us what he is doing and why. But the same cannot be said for Plato. For Plato, our remoter author, also presents us with a conversation (between Euclides and Terpsion), but he never emerges from hiding. The framing dialogue itself partakes of the same format

[8] For Euclides see Kahn (1996) 12-15.

[9] Thesleff (1982) 59-60. But see Kahn (1996) 19-20, 23 on the possibility of dramatic dialogue in Aeschines of Sphettus and Antisthenes.

[10] Kahn (1996) 32-5.

[11] Bastianini, Sedley (1995) 270-1, 487.

(direct dialogue) as the internal dialogue, while *not* providing us with an authorial explanation. We are never told how Plato came to know what he writes and why he writes the way he does. Are we meant to supply Euclides' explanation? That Plato is faithfully reporting things he heard from someone? The narratological asymmetry between frame dialogue and Platonic silence discourages this move, quite apart from the many philosophical reasons we have to disbelieve the notion of Plato as a philosophical reporter. Simply put, Plato never reveals his source, even ostensibly. The programmatic exclusion of literary genealogy creates a tension: without an orientating framework, how are we meant to distinguish fact from fiction? Do we simply assume the rules of a genre and go with the (fictive) flow while suspending our disbelief? Yet a cardinal rule of philosophy as it is presented in the Platonic corpus is to examine one's assumptions. Usually we think of this imperative in terms of assumptions about justice or similar concepts, but it applies equally to literary assumptions. We are, as with all the dialogues, intentionally left in the dark about the precise status of the account. Plato never tells us plainly what *he* thinks justice is, although his characters explore the problem. Similarly he never theorizes his literary practice, although Euclides nibbles suggestively round the edges of the problem. We cannot entirely accept Euclides' model, however, just as we have trouble accepting another programmatic contention, this time by Socrates in the *Republic*. In his discussion of imitation there, Socrates declares that direct discourse in which the author pretends to be someone he is not, is morally reprehensible (392c-398b). Some leeway is left for one who imitates good people in direct discourse (396c-e), but nevertheless, it is unclear how Plato's own practice is intended to relate to these strictures.

There exists a tension, then, between Plato's practice in the *Theaetetus* and the discussion of the prologue. This tension is important not least because it feeds into a whole series of issues that are important for the philosophy of the dialogue. As so often with Plato, literary problems *are* philosophical problems. This discussion may now broaden its scope to explore how the issues raised by the prologue are reflected in the body of the dialogue. The *Theaetetus* examines the problems associated with the definitions of knowledge. The body of the dialogue begins with an examination and refutation of Protagoras' theory that knowledge is perception, that whatever is regarded as

just, or beautiful *is* so, for as long as the belief maintains itself (167b-c). This raises a fundamental question about how we are meant to evaluate (or theorize) the status of the objects of our perception. Socrates will combat the theory that knowledge is perception because it implies that reality is unstable. He thinks that the theory is refuted by cases of misperception, what happens with dreams, insanity and other diseases (157e). As Theaetetus says, it is false when a madman believes he is a god, or a dreamer thinks he has wings and is flying (158b). The importance of dreaming will be the subject of the following section, but before focusing on it, let us pause briefly to consider the significance of Protagorean relativism for our understanding of Platonic (or any other) fiction. Protagoras maintains that what is present to our senses is true for us. A wind may be cool to one person and warm to another, but they are both correct. Might we not say that a fictional world maintains itself as long as it can make itself present to our perceptions? While we read or listen to Homer or Plato or Heliodorus, the story is present to us. We are carried along by the narrative, shuddering, crying, or laughing (cf. Plato *Ion* 535e; Gorgias, *Encomium of Helen* 9). We entertain it, if briefly, as a type of reality. One might consider Protagoras' theory of truth in perception congenial to the construction of secondary fictional worlds. The problem, of course, is that these secondary worlds are not real, and the reader usually knows it. The production of emotional conviction in fictional worlds is, as Gorgias would say, a type of deception in which the one deceived is wiser than the one who is not deceived (*DK* 82B23). To think these worlds real would be an example of misperception. This would be the mistake made by those who take the Platonic dialogue as the vivid reproduction of an actual conversation. Euclides makes efforts in this direction, but we are not to follow him. It is more useful to follow up the line of thought suggested by Socrates when he talks of misperceptions, such as dreams, things that we (incorrectly) believe to be real.

Dreaming

This question of dreams is a resonant one, as Socrates points out. People ask "what evidence one might give, if someone were to ask right now this instant whether we're asleep and are dreaming all the things that we are thinking, or whether we're awake and are talking

to each other in the waking world" (158b-c). Theaetetus replies: "Indeed, Socrates, it's a puzzle to know what evidence one should bring to bear. For all the same things accompany the two states, as if they corresponded with each other. For nothing stops us thinking in our sleep too that we are having with each other the same conversation we have just now been engaged in. And when we dream that we are narrating dreams, the resemblance of the one to the other is extraordinary" (158c). We are not to think that dream perceptions and waking perceptions are equally valid. But it does seem to be a truth of experience that it is impossible to tell dream from reality once one is in the dream. This might provide a valuable model for our understanding of fictional worlds (as my epigraph suggests). In the internal conversation in the dialogue, Socrates and Theaetetus talk about the difficulty of distinguishing dream experience from waking experience, and this problem is recognized as a crux. They think they know that the conversation they are having is a real one, but realize that it might be difficult to tell whether they are in a dream. Yet in a way they are. They are in Plato's representation of Euclides' recreation of Socrates' narrative.[12] Now the problem of the missing Platonic frame returns. For Euclides, the reality of the conversation is unproblematic, but he is only a character in a framing element created by a more remote author, Plato. This author has given us no indication what status we are meant to give to the dialogue. Even the frame with Euclides and Terpsion may be a dream – but this time, Plato's dream. As with any dream, we entertain it with the utmost seriousness while experiencing it.

Dreaming has further, wider resonance in the world of Platonic philosophy, and indeed, in the archaic and classical thought world. Since the age of Homer, the dream, along with the shadow, had been a useful image for fragility of humanity. Pindar calls man "the dream of a shadow" (*Pythian* 8.95), while Aristophanes' birds describe mortals as dreamlike and shadow-like (Aristoph. *Birds* 686-7).[13] Plato, as so often, takes traditional images and wisdom and recasts them in a new metaphysical framework. He will sometimes use the

---

[12] Cf. Gallop (1971) 190 n. 10. Laird (1993) 170-1 shows intriguingly how the philosophical question 'how do I know I'm not dreaming?' may also lie at the heart of Apuleius' *The Golden Ass*.

[13] See also Aesch. *Prometheus Bound* 448-50, and his description of the old as "a dream that wanders in daylight" (*Agamemnon* 82).

image of the dream (as—even more widely—that of the shadow) to suggest that we are mere images, shadows, dreams of our potential selves.[14] Indeed, a full investigation of Platonic fiction would have to investigate the complex interaction between image, dream, and shadow. Notwithstanding this general desideratum, the subject of dreaming in the Platonic corpus has received some careful and illuminating attention, particularly with reference to the *Theaetetus*. As noted above, the dream state in Plato may be an image for a mode of deluded or non-philosophical consciousness.[15] But, as Desjardins points out, material presented as the content of a dream is significant.[16] Such a presentation may imply "a refusal to take a firm stand for or against a view that keeps suggesting itself as worthy of attention but which needs a hard examination before one can commit oneself to its truth."[17] Dreaming, then, symbolizes an ambiguous metaphysical status, and demands interpretation. This will make it a flexible image, encompassing within its scope everything from real dreams, to delusion, to philosophical reverie and analysis.

The comparison of everyday knowledge to dreaming is nicely encapsulated in the passage of the *Statesman* where the Eleatic Stranger makes the Young Socrates aware that we haven't really tied down most of the things we think we know: "Each of us is in danger of knowing all the things we know as if in a dream and then in turn not knowing them, as if awake" (*Plt.* 277d2-4, cf. *Meno* 85c). In comparison with philosophic certainty, our most cherished opinions will be revealed as dreams. In fact, the entire phenomenal world, from the point of view of one who believes in the Forms, is merely an image. So, short of absolute knowledge (which has not yet been achieved by any character presented in the Platonic corpus), it is impossible to make firm distinctions between the real and the unreal. Our dreams are less real than our waking world, but even that waking world is less real (more dreamlike) than the ultimate and stable truth.[18] What we think we know is dream knowledge.

Let us now return to the connection between dreaming and the fictional status of the Platonic dialogue. I suggested above that in

[14] Cf. Vernant (1991b) 171 with n.12.
[15] Gallop (1971).
[16] Desjardins (1980-81) 110.
[17] Burnyeat (1970) 104; cf. Rorty (1972) 229-30.
[18] For detailed discussion of this contrast, see Gallop (1971).

light of *Theaetetus* 158b-c the Platonic dialogue might be viewed as a kind of dream. Yet this does not mean that it is a delusion, rather that each dialogue demands rigorous philosophical examination. In *Republic* 9 (571c-572b), Socrates asserts that dreams differ according to whether the rational part of the soul is in control. Thus people mastered by desire have violent and shameless dreams, while those whose rational part predominates can reach out towards the unknown in their dreams and apprehend the truth. There can, then, be good dreams that seek to apprehend the truth. The description of this rational dreamer in the *Republic* (572a1-3) says that his apprehension covers the past, present, and future – precisely the traditional sphere of competence of poets like Hesiod. Part of Plato's project is to correct traditional literature by means of a reformed, philosophical version of literary culture. His dialogues are like the rational dreams of a trained intellect, creating engrossing images of philosophical search. They are not real—that is, they are merely representations of philosophical conversations—but they are beneficial (unlike the representations of corrupt sophists and poets). Just like dreams, they do not announce their narrative status. Indeed, an adequate apparatus for constructing an explicit theory of fiction would require the kind of extended treatment of false statement we find in the *Sophist* (260a-264b). Yet in that dialogue, the examination of false statement is focused on sophistic rather than philosophical production.

The final occurrence of the motif of dream knowledge in the dialogue makes the point that even serious philosophical hypotheses may be regarded as dreams. Theaetetus' last effort at defining knowledge is to say that it is true *doxa* with an account (201c-d). He has just remembered this definition (which he will ultimately be unable to defend). Perhaps it is this sudden return of something forgotten that makes Socrates describe it as a "dream" (201d8); it comes out of nowhere, the way we suddenly remember a dream. In return he gives his own 'dream,' that is, the theory he has heard about accounts of elements and complexes (201d-202c). This theory proves ultimately to be unsustainable (hence, perhaps, its description as a dream).[19] Nevertheless it is significant that a respectable philosophical theory is described as a dream, just as such theories can sometimes be called

[19] Burnyeat (1970) 103-4.

mythoi, stories.[20] Here is another indication that the truth status of any account in this world is unstable. Not only are the dialogues dreams, but the theories canvassed inside them. It is up to each of us to turn the image of philosophical discussion into philosophical truth. Image, fiction, and reality are to be evaluated on a sliding scale.[21] Some fictions, images, dreams are more real than others. Dreams, then, are a useful model for the practice of fiction in general and Platonic fiction in particular. It is no surprise that the more sophisticated of the Greek novels deploy dreams among the devices that require interpretation and "compel their readers to reflect on and evaluate their own ability to read."[22] The second-order implications of dream imagery in Plato work to the same end.

Fictional Authority

This final section will briefly examine the construction of Protagoras as an explicitly fictional interlocutor in the *Theaetetus*. This portrayal both supports the contention that the question of the fictional status of the Platonic dialogue is a subtext running through the *Theaetetus*, and provides some guidance about the rules by which the game of philosophical fiction is played. It was noted above that Protagoras' relativistic thesis of knowledge as perception (presented as a consequence of his assertion that "man is the measure of all things") might have as one problematic consequence the confusion of the fictional and the real. The refutation of this thesis takes up the first part of the dialogue. Theodorus, the mutual friend of Socrates and Protagoras is set up as the latter's supporter. After a first attempt at refutation, So c-rates remarks that Protagoras would certainly come to the aid of his thesis, if he were alive. In the interests of justice, they must try to reconstruct his defence (164e), and Socrates then proceeds to imagine what Protagoras would say (165e-166a). Of course, Protagoras cannot be there to answer for himself because he is dead. This leads to a further question, however. Why has Plato set the scene in this way? He could easily have designed a dialogue in which Protagoras was alive, but clearly he wants Protagoras to be what we might call a historical fiction. Historical accuracy might be at stake here (that is,

20 Morgan (2000) 249-89.
21 Cf. Laird (1993) 174.
22 Bartsch (1989) 37.

Protagoras never did have a conversation with Socrates and Theaetetus), but that does not seem to have bothered Plato on other occasions. More important is that the argument with a fictive Protagoras can serve as a more general model for the construction of philosophical conversation. The construction of Protagoras could reflect Plato's procedure with Socrates.

Protagoras' deadness doesn't stop him from playing a lively part in the conversation. We are presented a series of lively and direct scenarios with large amounts of direct discourse as Protagoras defends himself. Of course, all of this happens through the mouth of Socrates, and Socrates recognises this when he says, that he has defended the thesis as well as he can, but that if Protagoras were alive, he would have done better. Yet immediately afterwards he says, "Did you notice when Protagoras was speaking just now and reproaching us ... he glorified his measure argument and commanded us to be serious about it?" (168c8-d4). The fictional Protagoras is both perfectly lively and 'real' and perfectly fictional. Moreover, Socrates talks to Protagoras as though he were present, as when he says, "What, then, Protagoras, shall we make of your theory?" (170c). There are, however, limits to this kind of presentation. At 169e Socrates considers whether they were right or wrong to have made Protagoras concede that some people were in fact superior in wisdom. He feels a need to reconsider the matter, in case it might be thought that he and Theodorus were *akurous* (without authority, 169e3) in making the concession on his behalf. In any portrayal of philosophical discussion, even if it is a dream and a fiction, one must be true to the spirit of the philosopher portrayed. As Protagoras says, "Whenever you are considering one of my theories using the method of question and answer, if the one questioned trips up by making the sort of answer that I would, then I am refuted, but if he makes a different sort of answer, then the one who is questioned is refuted" (166a-b).

Protagoras is an interesting exponent of a philosophical style and way of life, and Plato wants to explore this. He is not worried about the propriety of representing Protagoras, as long as he is, in his own estimation, intellectually true to what Protagoras would have said. It is notable, however, that in the end Socrates must abandon his attempt to speak on Protagoras' behalf, and simply say what the argument makes him say (171d). What applies to Protagoras may also apply to Socrates. Socrates was dead, but represented a style and way

of life that was both paradigmatic and literarily reproducible. As long as Plato can write what he thinks Socrates might have said in response to a problem, he can regard himself as writing beneficial fiction and exercising a legitimate authority. It is notable that there comes a point in the dialogue where Socrates refuses to pursue an argument (criticism of those who hold that the universe is an unmoving unity). He does so because he cannot be sure that he understands the theory in all its richness and because of his personal respect for Parmenides (183e-184a). Here may be a place where (we infer) Plato feels unauthorised to put an argument into Socrates' mouth.[23]

All the three areas of the *Theaetetus* surveyed in this paper are concerned with authority. The prologue purports to establish a literary pedigree for the work, but Euclides' claims of ventriloquized authorship and explicit method contrast Plato's own silence. Euclides exerts authority, Plato does not. Our uncertainty about the nature of the authority we give to the dialogue mirrors philosophical concerns expressed in the dialogue about the authority we should give to our perceptions.[24] The model of the dream is a useful way to understand both the status of these perceptions (along with the so-called 'knowledge' that arises from them) and the status of historico-fictional constructs like the Platonic dialogue. Finally Plato's treatment of an authorised and fictionalised Protagoras can be seen as an analogue to the authorised and fictionalised Socrates. Both are the product of the rational dreaming of a controlled intellect. They make no claims to accuracy, yet Plato's attempt to portray a rigorous search for truth in a world where we are often misled by perception means that the dialogue has special status as a veridical and protreptic dream. Although Plato refuses to theorise his own practice, he implicitly creates a suggestive model for what is involved in the process of fiction. For Plato to give a well-rounded philosophical account of what was involved in his own fictional practice, he would have needed an expanded account of false and true statement, and would perhaps have diverted his literary and philosophical attention from the area where he wanted it to rest. Before we can give an accurate account of our dreams, we have to work out what it is to be awake.[25]

---

[23] Morgan (2000) 251 n. 18.

[24] For a similar approach see Johnson (1998).

[25] I would like to thank Michael Haslam for helpful comments on earlier versions of this article.

FICTION AS A DISCOURSE OF PHILOSOPHY IN LUCIAN'S *VERAE HISTORIAE*

Andrew Laird

> Now poetry and philosophy are two names for what is, in reality, a single thing, differing within itself only to the extent that, as one might hold, day is distinct from the light of the sun falling on the earth, or the sun in its course over the earth is distinct from the day… What else is the point of a myth? It is a doctrine concealed beneath adornments of a different kind, like the statues that the priests of the mysteries have clothed in gold and silver and robes, so as to make their appearance the more impressive.
>
> Maximus of Tyre *Oration* 4.1.5

The formal and stylistic influence of philosophical dialogue on the ancient novel in general has been recognised for a long time.[1] However, the extent to which ancient prose fiction itself might self-consciously be a vehicle of philosophy has been very much ignored. The basic aim of this paper will be to illustrate the profundity of the relationship between philosophy and fiction – by concentrating mainly on a particular aspect of this relationship in the *Verae Historiae* or *True Stories*: the complex response to Plato in this text. The engagement with a range of philosophical traditions—Platonist, Pythagorean and Stoic—as well as individual philosophers, like Empedocles, Socrates, and Zeno, is a major feature of Lucian's work.[2] However, this discussion will be confined to consideration of Plato's *Republic* as a model for Lucian's *Verae Historiae*. But this consideration might have some important consequences for our understanding of the nature and evolution of ancient fiction.

From the beginning, it is important to bear in mind that the categorical boundaries between genres of discourse which are essential to classicists today were not always so prominent or so self-evident to

[1] See e.g. Bakhtin (1981), Rohde (1876).

[2] Abundant material and bibliography can now be found in Georgiadou, Larmour (1998). On Lucian's relation to Plato, Tackaberry (1930) is still useful.

ancient readers and writers.[3] Part of the process of commentary and explication has always been to classify generically any ancient text under scrutiny.[4] The *Verae Historiae* has not been exempted from this process. The resounding conclusion is that this is a work of comic romance. The satirical elements add only a modicum of gravity to a work that is primarily supposed to be funny.[5] The panorama of Lucian's works within their literary and cultural background inclines one to this consensus. However, the complexity, suggestiveness, and open-ended quality of this particular text, so finely articulated by Massimo Fusillo, might serve as a *caveat*.[6] The multiple, dialogical perspectives and possible worlds generated by Lucian's narrative mean that the consensus verdict of *Verae Historiae* as entertaining fiction can only be provisional.

Attempts to establish the relationship between Lucian's *Verae Historiae* and philosophy call for a second, more general, *caveat*. It is important to be clear about the different ways 'philosophy' can be conceived: as a *practice* professional or otherwise, as a technical form of argument, system building or ideology, as a genre of discourse, or even literature.[7] Where Plato is concerned, for instance, I argue elsewhere that *all* the elements in his philosophical dialogues—including, say, inherited myth, invented fiction, or *mise-en-scène*—could well constitute philosophical discourse, *de facto*.[8] This obtains even if Plato's dialogues often appear to constitute philosophy in a weaker or more open sense than current standards permit. That realisation has important consequences for the morals we draw about the reading of Plato (or even 'philosophy' as a whole) in the *Verae Historiae*. Here Lucian is not just generally involved with philosophy – he is specifically concerned with the relation between philosophy and invented fiction.

---

[3] For an excellent discussion of modern treatments of ancient genre, see Rosenmeyer (1985); contrast Cairns (1972) and even Genette (1992). Conte (1994) is also pertinent.

[4] This tradition ultimately goes back to the accessus in late antiquity; see the contributions to Most (1999) and Gibson, Kraus (2002).

[5] σπουδαῖος εἰς τὸ γελασθῆναι is Eunapius' appropriate comment on Lucian *Vit. Soph.* ed. Dübner (1878), 454. Anderson (1976) 1-11, Bompaire (1958), Perry (1967), Reardon (1989a) 619-20 all concur that the *VH* primarily serves to amuse.

[6] Fusillo (1988).

[7] See e.g. Wilson Nightingale (1995).

[8] Laird (2001).

He begins his famous preface by justifying the importance of recreation for those engaged in intellectual pursuits (*VH* 1.1):

> ὥσπερ τοῖς ἀθλητικοῖς καὶ περὶ τὴν τῶν σωμάτων ἐπιμέλειαν ἀσχολουμένοις οὐ τῆς εὐεξίας μόνον οὐδὲ τῶν γυμνασίων φροντίς ἐστιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς κατὰ καιρὸν γινομένης ἀνέσεως - μέρος γοῦν τῆς ἀσκήσεως τὸ μέγιστον αὐτὴν ὑπολαμβάνουσιν - οὕτω δὴ καὶ τοῖς περὶ τοὺς λόγους ἐσπουδακόσιν ἡγοῦμαι προσήκειν μετὰ τὴν πολλὴν τῶν σπουδαιοτέρων ἀνάγνωσιν ἀνιέναι τε τὴν διάνοιαν καὶ πρὸς τὸν ἔπειτα κάματον ἀκμαιοτέραν παρασκευάζειν.

> Athletes and people who take an interest in the care of the body do not confine their attentions to physical exercise and keeping fit. They also take thought for relaxation (*anesis*) at the right moments; indeed they consider it the most important part of training. Similarly I think those who are committed to arguments (*logoi*) after a great deal of reading/recognition of more serious things (*tõn spoudaioterõn anagnõsin*) should relax their intellect (*dianoia*) and render it sharper for the next exertion.[9]

There are established parallels for such educational application of *anesis* in Plato, Seneca, and Quintilian.[10] Most translations seem to reflect or further the critical assumption that the contrast Lucian makes is between *serious* and popular literature.[11] That assumption reflects a polarity which we hold far more instinctively than Lucian would: whilst Aristotle may have conceived of ποίησις ('poetry') as 'literature' in our sense, and then of some literature as serious, it is far from certain that every other Greek author did so too.[12] My translation of this opening passage is designed to show that words used in it are really more evocative of a philosophical sort of education. This is also borne out by the next couple of sentences – if we look closely at some of the Greek terms used:

> γένοιτο δ' ἂν ἐμμελὴς ἡ ἀνάπαυσις αὐτοῖς, εἰ τοῖς τοιούτοις τῶν ἀναγνωσμάτων ὁμιλοῖεν, ἃ μὴ μόνον ἐκ τοῦ ἀστείου τε καὶ χαρίεντος ψιλὴν παρέξει τὴν ψυχαγωγίαν, ἀλλά τινα καὶ θεωρίαν οὐκ ἄμουσον ἐπιδείξεται. (*VH* 1.2)

---

[9] The translations from the *VH* are my own.

[10] Plato *Laws* 724A-B; Seneca *De Tranquillitate Animi* 17.5; Quintilian *Inst.* 1.3.8.

[11] E.g. Reardon (1989a) 621, Cataudella (1990) 53.

[12] See Arist. *Poetics* 1447a-b. According to Halliwell (1986) 277 Aristotle's theory of poetry has an "evaluative aspect": ποίησις might then be like our idea of 'literature' which is value-laden as well as descriptive.

> The break [from serious things] should actually be appropriate for those readers if it inclines them to be involved with passages of the kind which, through grace and charm, bring about a sheer flight of the mind (*psuchagõgia*), at the same time as pointing the way to a refined form of contemplation (*theõrian ouk amouson*).

The words *psychagõgia* and *theõria* here have not prompted much comment from scholars. *Psychagõgia*, which is suggestive of the transporting effect of speech and poetry, is most often used in discussions of those effects by philosophers – particularly in Plato and in the Platonic tradition.[13] Ian Rutherford and others have been exploring the broader aspects of *theõria* in Greek literature and culture, but the notion is also particular to Plato, who uses *theõria* and its cognates in his philosophical fictions or as a figurative vehicle of thought.[14]

The upshot is that even only this far in, the opening of *Verae Historiae* addresses discourses and intellectual activities closer to philosophy than literature: even though the use of humour and irony here should not be ignored. In fact the slant of Lucian's irony is already directed to foreground the relation between philosophy and the generation of fiction. If Plato had ever been pedestrian enough to treat us to an *explicit* rationale for the use of myth in the dialogues, one could imagine it containing similar sentiments to those expressed in these prefatory sentences by Lucian.

The whole passage is perhaps best known for what comes next: the outright and outrageous pledge that the author will tell lies in a plausible and convincing manner. The productions of poets, historians and philosophers are parodied, with Ctesias, Iambulus, and Odysseus as named examples. Lucian says that he could not fault the authors he had read for their lying because he saw "that this was already a practice common even for those professing to be philosophers" (*VH* 1.4: τοῦ ψεύσασθαι μὲν οὐ σφόδρα τοὺς ἄνδρας ἐμεμψάμην, ὁρῶν ἤδη σύνηθες ὂν τοῦτο καὶ τοῖς φιλοσοφεῖν

[13] For ψυχαγωγία see e.g. Plato *Phaedrus* 246, 261a, 271c; Aristotle *Poetics* 1450a33, 1450b17; Fraser (1972) 760 on Eratosthenes; Philodemus in Jensen (1923) col. 13, 33; Pfeiffer (1986) 166. This range of references is meant to show the wide range of applications the term can have.

[14] On θεωρία and cognates see e.g. *Republic* 359b, 402d4, 480a, 511c8; Croesus juxtaposes φιλοσοφέων with θεωρίη in Herod. 1.30; cf. Cicero *Tusculan Disputations* 5.3.8; Pythagoras also likened those engaging with philosophy to the audience of a *spectacle*.

ὑπισχνουμένοις). The claim in the Lucianic scholia that this comment is a retort to Plato's use of myth in *Rep.* 614-21 seems very plausible:

> τάχα εἰς Πλάτωνα ἀποτείνεται πολλαχοῦ μὲν καὶ ἀλλαχοῦ μυθολογοῦντα, μάλιστα δὲ ἐν τῷ δεκάτῳ τῆς Πολιτείας [614a sq.] τὰ περὶ τῶν ἐν Ἅιδου διεξιόντα. (Scholia in Luciani *VH* 1.4)
>
> The reference is probably to Plato recounting myths here, there and everywhere but especially in the tenth book of the *Republic,* where he elaborates about what is in Hades.

At first glance the tone of Colotes' attack on Plato quoted in Macrobius' commentary on the *Somnium Scipionis* appears consonant with this observation:

> *Ait a philosopho fabulam non opportuisse confingi quoniam nullum figmenti genus veri professoribus conveniret.* (Macrobius *In somn. Scip.* 1.2.3-5)
>
> Colotes says that a story should not be made up by a philosopher because no kind of fictional invention is suitable for those who profess truth.[15]

The trouble is that the sentiment attributed to Colotes does not square with Lucian's programme in the opening sentences of his preface which promise a work which will lead to *theõria*: the implication there, as we have seen, was that his work would serve the interests of—and even communicate directly—proper philosophical thought. What is going on? Is Lucian for or against fiction as a vehicle of philosophy? Or is he for it only when he's the one writing the fiction?

Lucian's mention of Odysseus and Alcinous at least suggests the scholiast is right to identify a connection with Plato, and particularly with Plato's myth of Er. This is because Plato's Socrates introduced that myth at *Republic* 614b1 by saying his *muthos* would not be like

---

[15] Macrobius 1.2.4-5 goes on to present Colotes' words as follows: '*Cur enim', inquit, 'si rerum caelestium notionem, si habitum nos animarum docere voluisti, non simplici et absoluta hoc insinuatione curatum est sed quaesita persona casusque excogitata novitas et composita advocati scaena figmenti ipsam quaerendi veri ianuam mendacio polluerunt?* "Why," he asks, "if you wanted to teach us a conception of things in heaven and the condition of souls, did you not take the trouble to do this in a simple and straightforward way? But instead you sought a character, worked out a new plot, and invented a scenario, which all polluted with mendacity the very portal of the truth we are seeking."

Odysseus' tale to Alcinous (ἀλλ' οὐ μέντοι σοι, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, 'Αλκίνου γε ἀπόλογον ἐρῶ), a tale which Lucian has already dismissed as grossly far fetched. Socrates' disclaimer could have implied that his story would not be too long—the account of Odysseus was proverbially lengthy—or could it be that Socrates' story, in contrast to Odysseus', is to be believed? There may then be a significant irony in Lucian's use of the names of Odysseus and Alcinous in his thinly veiled critique of *Republic* 614.

Once the narrative of *Verae Historiae* gets underway, another sophisticated fictional construction from Plato's *Republic* twice impacts on Book 1: the allegory of the Cave. The victorious military strategy of the Sun People in their war against the Moon People in Chapter 19 provides the first occasion:

> ἀναστρέψαντες δὲ τὸ μεταξὺ τοῦ ἀέρος ἀπετείχιζον, ὥστε μηκέτι τὰς αὐγὰς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἡλίου πρὸς τὴν σελήνην διήκειν. τὸ δὲ τεῖχος ἦν διπλοῦν, νεφελωτόν ὥστε σαφὴς ἔκλειψις τῆς σελήνης ἐγεγόνει καὶ νυκτὶ διηνεκεῖ πᾶσα κατείχετο. (*VH* 1.19)
>
> [The Sun people] built a wall through the sky between Sun and Moon, so that the Sun's rays no longer reached the Moon. The wall was made of a double thickness of clouds; the Moon was totally eclipsed and plunged into continuous night.

As Georgiadou and Larmour note in their commentary, "in philosophical terms this means shutting off the source of knowledge."[16] But the influence of Plato's Cave in the account of the time our narrator and his companions spend inside the body of the whale is far more sustained. The effect is very striking in the ekphrasis which opens this episode:

> ἐπεὶ δὲ ἔνδον ἦμεν, τὸ μὲν πρῶτον σκότος ἦν καὶ οὐδὲν ἑωρῶμεν, ὕστερον δὲ αὐτοῦ ἀναχανόντος εἴδομεν κύτος μέγα καὶ πάντῃ πλατὺ καὶ ὑψηλόν, ἱκανὸν μυριάνδρῳ πόλει ἐνοικεῖν. (*VH* 1.31)
>
> When we got inside it was dark at first and we could see nothing; later on however when the whale opened its jaws we saw a great cavern, broad in every direction and high, big enough to hold a large city.

And the effect is no less conspicuous as the description, which plays on the words for a 'hollow' (κύτος) and 'whale' (κῆτος), continues:

---

[16] Georgiadou, Larmour (1998) 118.

καὶ ὅλως ἐῴκειμεν τοῖς ἐν δεσμωτηρίῳ μεγάλῳ καὶ ἀφύκτῳ τρυφῶσι καὶ λελυμένοις. Ἐνιαυτὸν μὲν οὖν καὶ μῆνας ὀκτὼ τοῦτον διήγομεν τὸν τρόπον ... ἅπαξ γὰρ δὴ τοῦτο κατὰ τὴν ὥραν ἑκάστην ἐποίει τὸ κῆτος, ὥστε ἡμᾶς πρὸς τὰς ἀνοίξεις τεκμαίρεσθαι τὰς ὥρας. (*VH* 1.39-40)

Altogether we resembled men in a great prison where we were free to live an easy life but from which we could not escape. This was how we lived for one year and eight months … the whale [opened his mouth] once an hour you see, and that was how we told the time.

The models for these passages are clearly from the famous description of the Cave in the *Republic* 514a-18b, particularly the passages 514, 516a-d. Lucian's sketch in fact serves to 'excavate' and bring to prominence—more than even Porphyry's allegory—the fictional dynamic of Socrates' *eikon* (or 'image') as a vehicle of philosophical thought and even as a *mise en abyme* for the mimetic endeavour of the *Republic* as a whole. In particular, it prompts an important reflection on this episode in the Platonic dialogue. Glaucon comments on the scenario Socrates has unfolded, and Socrates replies:

Ἄτοπον, ἔφη, λέγεις εἰκόνα καὶ δεσμώτας ἀτόπους.
Ὁμοίους ἡμῖν, ἦν δ' ἐγώ. (*Republic* 515a5)

"A strange *eikon*" he said "you are presenting and strange captives."
"They are just like us" I said.

By saying that the captives are just like himself and Glaucon, Socrates is normally taken to be making a point about human life in general. But Socrates' remark could instead refer specifically to Socrates and his companions in the dialogue *as* characters in the dialogue. Being mere characters in a dialogue which is a craftily engineered *mimesis*, Socrates' friends live in the trap, which all of Plato's readers have fallen into at this point—except perhaps Lucian, of thinking that Plato's characters and the world they occupy, are in some sense real.

The references to Plato in the second book of *Verae Historiae* also offer an implicit response to Platonic philosophical fiction which, taken together, can throw further light on Lucian's position. The Islands of the Blest parody the narrative of Er, as well as the *katabasis* in Homer, *Odyssey* 11. There are clear elements of Platonic philosophy in Lucian's account. For instance, in 2.12 the properties of the inhabitants of the Island who "do not have bodies but are intangible

and fleshless" (αὐτοὶ δὲ σώματα μὲν οὐκ ἔχουσιν, ἀλλ' ἀναφεῖς καὶ ἄσαρκοι) are suggestive of Platonic forms. As "upright shadows, only not black" they are specifically comparable to the shadowy souls in *Phaedo* 81D as well as the *skiai* ("shades") in *Odyssey* 10.495.

The specific mentions of Socrates and Plato in 2.17 contain significant ironies which foreground the fictive nature not only of Platonic myth, but also of Plato's dialogues themselves. On Rhadamanthus' island, Socrates surrounds himself with Hyacinthus, Narcissus, and Hylas: he shows most attention to Hyacinthus because it was "he [who] refuted him most often" (τὰ πολλὰ γοῦν ἐκεῖνον διήλεγχεν). However comically, Lucian places Socrates' dialectic in a narrative context – just as in Plato's works dialectic is never a disembodied technique, but one which is embedded in the mimetic drama of characterised exchange. As for Plato himself, we are told:

> Πλάτων δὲ μόνος οὐ παρῆν, ἀλλ' ἐλέγετο [καὶ] αὐτὸς ἐν τῇ ἀναπλασθείσῃ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ πόλει οἰκεῖν χρώμενος τῇ πολιτείᾳ καὶ τοῖς νόμοις οἷς συνέγραψεν. (*VH* 2.17)
>
> Plato alone was not there – but it was said he was living in the city which he had created (*anaplastheisè*) by himself, using the Republic and the Laws he had written.

Should we italicise the words 'Republic' and 'Laws' to make them into book titles in our translation? It is likely (but not conclusively the case) that the dialogues we know as the *Laws* and *Republic* were known by these names to Lucian. But ancient literary critical discussions frequently exploit the slippage between the title of a work and the words' more general significations. It looks as if Lucian is here exploiting that sort of slippage to great effect. A good deal is done by the ingenious use of the verb ἀναπλάσσω. This word, which could roughly correspond in its meanings to *fingo* ('forge,' 'feign') in Latin, is used by Socrates in another work by Lucian: the *Vitarum Auctio* (or *Philosophies for Sale*). In chapter 17, Socrates claims in his own words to have created (*anaplasas*) a city for himself:

> Οἰκῶ μὲν ἐμαυτῷ τινα πόλιν ἀναπλάσας, χρῶμαι δὲ πολιτείᾳ ξένῃ καὶ νόμους νομίζω τοὺς ἐμούς. (*VA* 17)
>
> I dwell in a city I created myself; I use a strange constitution and I hold to the laws as my own.

Within the realm of Lucian's fiction, Plato is able to create a realm of fiction which Plato himself can inhabit. Plato's imaginary realms thus possess the same ontological status as the realm presented by Lucian here. His achievement is presented by Lucian as the generation of possible worlds.[17]

It is this achievement of Plato which is foregrounded overall, as we survey the aspects of Plato which cumulatively emerge from the *Verae Historiae*. The central role Lucian gives to the myths and fictions in the *Republic* and the significance of the *Republic* itself as a form of *anaplasis* is something which eludes most contemporary readers of Plato. Certainly the idea of the Cave as a reflexive emblem for the *Republic* itself as a fictional realm of imitations from which we can emerge, and thence interrogate the world of our experience, is salutary. If we had been compelled to reconstruct our knowledge of Plato from the *Verae Historiae* alone, he would emerge from 2.18 as a philosopher whose invented world was of such power that he came to inhabit it.

In fact, the *Republic* is more than just one of the many available literary models for this narrative. It could constitute a principle foundation for Lucian's text. In addition to the allusions to the *Republic* I have indicated, the narrative style in the *Verae Historiae* also recalls that of the Myth of Er in a number of ways. For instance, Lucian's narrator, like Plato's, uses geographical description and physical movement to engineer the story sequence; his abrupt ending, though found in other works, echoes the closural techniques in Plato's myths and of the dialogues enclosing them. Moreover, it should not be forgotten that the dense allusiveness which has been so central to critical discussions of the *Verae Historiae* is also an evident trait of Platonic myth – the intertextuality of the Myth of Er itself is the subject of a discussion by Michael Silk.[18]

But the philosophical implications of the generation of possible worlds through fiction are actually *more* evident in Lucian's work than they are in the *Republic.* Consider the very last few words of the second and final book:

τὰ δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐν ταῖς ἑξῆς βίβλοις διηγήσομαι. (*VH* 2.47)

---

[17] On the power of fictional worlds, see Jackson (1981), Serpieri (1986), as well as Laird (1993).
[18] Silk (2001).

> And what happened on the earth I will narrate in the books to follow.

The comment given by the scholia on that very last clause of the *Verae Historiae* rightly remarks that this ending is its "biggest lie" (ψευδέστατον).[19] It is such a big lie because a speech-act of this kind, coming at the end of the work bears on what linguists call the *pragmatics* of this text. The self-evidently mendacious claim that more books will follow (when they do not follow) is false in an extra-discursive way in which the other far-fetched claims in the story were not. And this closing speech-act coheres with Lucian's famous dictum from the preface, which I have yet to quote:

> ἐπὶ τὸ ψεῦδος ἐτραπόμην πολὺ τῶν ἄλλων εὐγνωμονέστερον κἂν ἓν γὰρ δὴ τοῦτο ἀληθεύσω λέγων ὅτι ψεύδομαι. οὕτω αὐτὸς δ' ἄν μοι δοκῶ καὶ τὴν παρὰ τῶν ἄλλων κατηγορίαν ἐκφυγεῖν αὐτὸς ὁμολογῶν μηδὲν ἀληθὲς λέγειν. (*VH* 1.4)
>
> I turned to fabrication (*epi to pseudos*) but far more sensibly than others, for I will be truthful in saying this one thing – that I am lying. By admitting voluntarily that I am in no way telling the truth, I think I am avoiding that charge being levelled at me from others.

Commentators have noted the resemblance this has to Socrates' profession that he knows more than other people:

> ἐλογιζόμην, ὅτι τούτου μὲν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐγὼ σοφώτερός εἰμι κινδυνεύει μὲν γὰρ ἡμῶν οὐδέτερος οὐδὲν καλὸν κἀγαθὸν εἰδέναι, ἀλλ' οὗτος μὲν οἴεταί τι εἰδέναι οὐκ εἰδώς, ἐγὼ δέ, ὥσπερ οὖν οὐκ οἶδα, οὐδὲ οἴομαι εἰδέναι. (Plato *Apology* 21D)[20]
>
> I thought that I am wiser than this man. For perhaps neither of us knows anything of beauty and excellence, but whilst he thinks he knows something when he doesn't know it, at least I don't think that I know when I don't know.

We might also recall Eubulides' 'liar paradox' (Is 'I am lying' simultaneously true or false?).[21] But the words κατηγορίαν ἐκφυγεῖν ("I am avoiding that charge") more strikingly evoke Socrates' position as it is presented in Plato's *Apology*: a speech in which Socrates defends himself against hostile charges.

---

[19] καὶ τὸ τέλος ψευδέστατον μετὰ τῆς ἀνυποστάτου ἐπαγγελίας. Schol in Luc. *VH* 2.47 ed. Rabe p. 24.

[20] Compare also *Apology* 20d-e, 29b.

[21] Diogenes Laertius is a source for Eubulides of Miletus, see e.g. 2.109. W and M. Kneale (1962) 113 for an account of Eubulides' place in the history of logic.

Lucian's own impressive paradox raised at the opening of *Verae Historiae* is not to be discarded by narrator and audience, once the tall tales he tells get under way. The resurrection of the paradox at the end of the work shows that it is something which perfuses the whole text – and our interpretation of Lucian's whole narrative should be informed by that dictum. Two further points can support this:

(i) First, a transition between the 'authorial' voice and the mendacious voice of the narrator is engineered by that dictum in the preface. The transition is notoriously problematised later on, in 2.28, by the epigram Homer writes to the involved fictional narrator, naming him as 'Lucian':

> τῇ δὲ ἐπιούσῃ ἐλθὼν πρὸς Ὅμηρον τὸν ποιητὴν ἐδεήθην αὐτοῦ ποιῆσαί μοι δίστιχον ἐπίγραμμα καὶ ἐπειδὴ ἐποίησεν, στήλην βηρύλλου λίθου ἀναστήσας ἐπέγραψα πρὸς τῷ λιμένι. τὸ δὲ ἐπίγραμμα ἦν τοιόνδε·
>
> Λουκιανὸς τάδε πάντα φίλος μακάρεσσι θεοῖσιν
> εἶδέ τε καὶ πάλιν ἦλθε φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν. (*VH* 2.28)
>
> The following day I went to Homer the poet and asked him to compose a two-line epigram for me. When he had done so, I inscribed it on a pillar of beryl I set up by the harbour. The epigram went like this:
>
> Lucian dear to the immortal gods saw all these things
> And returned to his dear native country.

Here the author Homer, as a *character*, is used to attribute the adventures of our character-narrator to its author, Lucian himself. (Incidentally Homer's distich also informs us that our narrator returned home – a detail that the narrator does not actually convey himself at the end of the *Verae Historiae*.)

Such problematisation of author-narrator transition is all too familiar to anyone who has had to tackle the problem of the Prologue of Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* and the teasing appellation of the Greek narrator Lucius as *Madaurensis* in the final book of that work.[22] Classicists may be more squeamish about the purely philosophical questions about presence and representation evinced by the inscription of *ego* in first person discourse than ethnologists, psychoanalysts, and

[22] The essays in Kahane and Laird (2001) provide a number of perspectives on this problem which is central to the interpretation of Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*.

philosophers in the post-Heideggerian tradition.[23] But these issues are given free play in Plato, Lucian and Apuleius at least, among ancient authors.[24]

(ii) The second point in support of my claim that important philosophical issues raised in the prologue of *Verae Historiae* run through the whole text is this. Lucian singles out by name three writers as charlatans. Two of them—the fifth century historian Ctesias of Cnidos (whose *Persica* and *Indica* were reputed for unreliability) and Iambulus (whose tall travel tales show him to be more romancer than historian)—were real authors.[25] Odysseus, however, whom Lucian identifies as the leader and instructor (ἀρχηγὸς καὶ … διδάσκαλος 1.3) of this clowning, has here become a *character* who is given equivalent 'real-life' status.[26] The significance of this manoeuvre, so early in the work, has not been given due attention. A phenomenological slippage is engineered here, which also pervades the whole work, between actual authors and a character like Odysseus who is neither in search or need of an author. This slippage bears as much on the construction of Lucian's own fiction and of himself as a narrator, as it does on his reading of Plato's fictions: as we saw, Lucian presented Plato as an author who enjoys living on the same ontological level as the worlds he has created.

The thorny problem of how Plato's myths and fictions are to be read in relation to his philosophy—if indeed the philosophy can be conceived independently of those myths and fictions—rebounds onto Lucian's construction of myths or fiction.[27] Speculations about the existential differences between historical and fictional personages, or about the relation between narrator and author, can only be philo-

[23] See e.g. Derrida (1967), (1972), Lacan (1966) and, on psychoanalysis as well as ethnology, Crapanzano (1992).

[24] On the role of the speaking 'I' in the Prologue to Apuleius' *Met.*, see e.g. Too (2001), Henderson (2001), and Fowler (2001). For the utopian tales of Iambulus, see also Holzberg (1996b).

[25] Even the few fragments preserved by Photius show Ctesias (born c. 440 B.C.) to be more concerned with elements of the fantasy than with historical truth; for the utopian tales of Iambulus (who perhaps wrote in the 3rd cent. B.C.), see Diodorus Siculus 2.55-60.

[26] This transition is obviously paralleled by Homer who makes Odysseus *narrator* of *Odyssey* 9-12 – and Plato's Socrates could be noting this earlier in the *Republic* at 393b2-5.

[27] On Plato's myths and the problem of fiction see Gill (1993) and again Laird (2001).

sophical.[28] The writing and reading of fiction will always invite epistemological speculation, and perhaps more general questions of a philosophical kind. Conversely, philosophy has always involved the generation (and on some level acceptance) of fictional scenarios from Plato's Cave to the brain in the vat. The construction and examination of 'possible worlds,' even when they are as entertaining as Lucian's, prompt questions of metaphysics as well as literary criticism. The *Verae Historiae* is not a conventional philosophy book. But the greatest works of philosophy are never conventional.[29]

[28] Lamarque, Olsen (1994) is a masterful treatment of some of the issues. New (1999) 108-23 offers a recent and accessible introduction.

[29] I would like to thank Don Fowler for encouraging me to develop the ideas in this essay. I am also grateful to Simon Swain and the editors for some very helpful comments on this piece, which I was able to complete as a Margo Tytus Fellow in the Department of Classics of the University of Cincinnati.

This page intentionally left blank

THE REPRESENTATION OF VIOLENCE
IN THE GREEK NOVELS AND MARTYR ACCOUNTS

Kathryn Chew

In this article I aim to discuss the lives of novel heroines and female martyrs and what significance violence plays in their narratives. Melania the Younger typifies the sort of young woman found as the subject of fourth or fifth century CE literature – she is well born, wealthy and beautiful. At the age of fourteen she is 'wounded by love' (τρωθεῖσα ἔρωτι) and her troubles begin. It would certainly be easy to confuse Melania's background with that of the Greek novel heroines – but there can be no mistaking that while the *erôs* that infects the heroines is of a decidedly earthly nature, the *erôs* which affects Melania is *theios*, divine – and the outcome of her erotic relationship with God is not conventional marriage but her death. It makes 'happily ever after' take on a whole new meaning.

I am focusing on the violence inflicted on heroines and female martyrs by other people during the course of their lives, and am examining the martyr accounts not as historical texts but as analogues to novels, literary pieces expressing the attitudes and ideals of their society.[1] This study grows out of a larger project on the literary and cultural relationship between the stories of the ancient novel heroines and early Christian female martyrs that seeks to explore both structural and thematic connections. Here I shall focus on the theme of violence and, in the interest of space, will limit my focus to the five romance heroines and these five martyrs: Agatha, Juliana, Euphemia,

[1] There are two types of early Christian saints: martyrs and confessors. Martyrs earn distinction by dying for their beliefs, usually because they refuse to acknowledge the superiority of other religions or gods, and confessors set examples of virtuous lives crowned by beatific deaths. Many accounts of the lives, acts, conversions and cults of these saints can be found in the *Patrologiae Cursus Completus* (*Series Graeca* [*PG*] and *Series Latina* [*PL*]), the *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* (*CSEL*), the *Acta Sanctorum* (*AASS*), and the *Sources Chrétiennes* (*SC*). I am focusing exclusively on martyr acts, although other literary forms such as epistles, sermons and encomia also discuss martyrs. Due to the nature of this study, the thorny issue of the historicity of each martyr's existence is not a concern; what matters is the literary life of each narrative.

Anastasia and Menodora.[2] Why would early Christianity appropriate a ‘pagan’ literary form? The capacity of the novel genre to represent spectacle allows writers of martyr accounts to market their faith through words as vividly as if their reader were present at the event itself. Bowersock (1995) argues that Roman culture’s predilection for spectacle creates a space in which spectacle-oriented Christian martyrdom could develop and flourish.[3] A ‘literary companion’ to these visually compelling spectacles, then, the martyr accounts are graphic testimony to Christianity’s waxing power.[4]

The structural influence of the novels on the martyr accounts is apparent in comparison. The novel stories revolve around a central romantically attached couple who are separated by life’s circumstances and individually suffer a plethora of indignities like kidnapping, attempted rape and slavery, before they are happily reunited. In the end the heroine’s chastity is her ticket to blissful matrimony with

---

[2] Although the martyrdoms of the saints in question are attributed to both the persecutions of Decius in 250-1 CE (Agatha and Anastasia) and those of Maximian in 303-5 CE (Juliana, Euphemia and Menodora), our earliest extant source for these particular narratives is the compiler Symeon the Logothete, also known as Metaphrastes, fl. 950-1000 CE, who gathered accounts from earlier sources, many of which are now lost or unavailable. The structure of these accounts, however, is nearly identical to that of similar accounts about Marcella by Jerome (348-420 CE) and about Agnes by Ambrose (339-97 CE). This suggests that the martyr account’s form crystallized at some point in the fourth century CE. Patristic literature from the fourth century onward abounds in references to these and other martyrs, as seen in the *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Graeca* and *Latina*, indicating that their stories were indeed known. There is a good chance, in my estimation, that these accounts did not change significantly over the centuries. The Syrian martyr accounts dating from the fourth to the seventh centuries CE translated by Brock and Harvey (1987) suggest the stability of this literature; some of these accounts are Syriac versions of particular Greek texts no longer extant but of which survive later versions (e.g. Pelagia) and others are accounts of female Syrian saints (e.g. Anahid) which are nearly identical to the Greek accounts in both structure and content.

[3] The literature on spectacle in antiquity is large. Feldherr (1998) 13 defines spectacle to include not only shows and theatrical productions but rituals and public acts as well. One issue regarding spectacle which remains to be answered thoroughly is why spectacle would be so relevant for Roman society at this particular time. I would start to answer this question by suggesting that the improved availability of resources and technology that support spectacle fed its demand, such as Pompey’s theatre, the first permanent theatre built in Rome in 55 BCE, and the Coliseum, the Flavian amphitheatre dedicated in 80 CE, not to mention emperors willing to deplete the imperial purse to finance such entertainment.

[4] Castelli (1995) 15-20 suggests that in the martyr narratives female saints such as Perpetua, Felicity, Agathonice, Blandina, Sabina, Anahid, and Febronia resist being the focus or object of their spectacles and that each takes some action calculated to refocus attention away from her and onto God. This is in contrast with the novels, whose heroines are more comfortable in their bodies.

the hero. The basic outline of most female martyrs' lives follows a similar pattern: the saint is the most beautiful woman in her region, is usually well-born and is completely devoted to God; her comeliness attracts the unwanted attentions of the local pagan magistrate who then uses all means of persuasion at his disposal to convince the woman to marry him or at least succumb to his lust, and then to sacrifice to his gods; at her adamant refusal, the martyr is interrogated and then tortured often to hyperbolic proportions, but suffers no lasting harm until she is finally granted martyrdom by God and joins God in heaven (*PG* 114: 1437-52).[5]

Violence is a staple part of the entertainment value of the Greek novels and martyr accounts. We catch our breath when Callirhoe is kicked in the chest, when Anthia is trussed up on a tree for sacrifice, when Leukippe is gutted or when Charikleia is trapped on a burning pyre, and we sigh with relief when each of the heroines escapes her many close encounters with rapists. The martyr accounts seem to use the heroines' stories as a point of departure: Juliana is stripped, beaten, hung up by her hair, showered with molten lead, chained, stretched on a wheel until her bones break and marrow spurts out, bathed in molten lead and finally beheaded. Even Leukippe has nothing on her. Nor, in fact, does any of the male martyrs, whose torture is generally short-lived.[6]

Why is physical violence such a significant part of these stories? Konstan (1994) suggests that heroines and heroes suffer equally and thus prove their worthiness for each other. The female martyrs then, in imitating the suffering of Jesus, demonstrate their devotion to their 'heavenly spouse.' But this does not account for the preoccupation

[5] This outline applies to the typical female martyr. Rarer are accounts of the young married martyr, who either convinces her husband to embrace a life of chastity and then to die with her (Caecilia, *PG* 116: 163-80) or repudiates her husband (Anastasia Junior, *PG* 116: 573-610); the motherly martyr, who either relinquishes her children (Perpetua or Felicity, *Acts of Christian Martyrs*) or watches them put to death (Sophia, *PG* 115: 497-514, or Symphorosa, *PG* 10: 65-68); and rarest of all is the widow martyr (Afra, *AASS*, 24 May). Types among confessor saints include the harlot convert (Mary of Egypt, *PG* 87 pt 3: 3697-726, or Thais, *PL* 73: 661-2), the transvestite monk (Theodora/Theodorus, *PG* 115: 665-90), the harlot convert transvestite monk (Pelagia/Pelagius, *PG* 116: 907-20 and Brock, Harvey [1987] 41-62), the ascetic virgin who refuses a husband (Thecla, *PG* 115: 821-46 and 85: 477-618), the widow (Monica, *AASS*, 4 May), the ascetic matron (Melania Junior, *PG* 116: 753-93), or the ascetic spinster (Macrina, *PG* 46: 959-1000).

[6] Eusebius (Lawlor, Oulton [1927-28] 361) contains a rare exception in which male Christians suffer sexual violence through castration as part of their tortures.

with physical violence in these stories and its frequent direction at women.[7] That physical violence is so important to these two very different social groups suggests that violence is in some way part of a cultural scene embraced by both groups, and that women somehow are a locus of contention within each group.[8] For both societies, violence within spectacle is a means of exhibiting the cultural supremacy of that group.[9] If spectacle is a form of conspicuous consumption, Roman society validates itself by its ability to stage such events.[10] Early Christian martyr society subverts the values of its oppressor to make the apparent defeat of its champion equivalent to a gladiatorial victory.[11] While such torture is a necessary and even welcome experience in the eyes of early Christians, in that sharing in Jesus' suffering guarantees eventual resurrection with Him, it remains to be explained why female martyrs receive the lion's share of torture – even though they are outnumbered by their male counterparts.[12] An examination of contemporary gender dynamics sheds light on how women fit into this development.

In ancient Greco-Roman society a woman's body is the locus of both her social worth and power. Her virginity before marriage and chastity afterward are important elements in others' estimation of her and in her own self-respect. Her ability to produce children, especially male heirs, adds to her social and familial worth. Thus in the Greek novels the heroines guard their virginity or chastity with tooth and nail, and are rewarded for their efforts by reintegration into their privileged places in society. Callirhoe rises even higher in her second husband's eyes after she delivers her son, who unites two powerful

[7] Brock, Harvey (1987) 24 note the pervasive appearance of violence against women in Syrian hagiographic narratives. Suffering need not include physical violence – the accounts of the ascetic desert monks abound in psychic agony; see Brown (1988) 213-40.

[8] As scholars of late antiquity find, literature tends to reflect and validate the ideology of its relevant social group. Perkins (1995) and Cooper (1996) show how the novels express the idealized world view of the Greco-Roman elite.

[9] Feldherr (1998) 101-2, 169 emphasizes the unifying and empowering force of spectacle for Roman society.

[10] Feldherr (1998) 185 argues that the individual champion's success credits the collective power of the state.

[11] Brown (1988) and (1990) 479-64 shows how early Christian thought subverts the ideology of the Roman elite; Clark (1998) 112 points out that the Christian doctrine of God's incarnation required a revaluation of the human body in relation to the soul and to God.

[12] Brock, Harvey (1987) 19-26.

bloodlines and cements the relationship between Ionia and Sicily. Likewise the traditional means to power for late antique empresses such as Flacilla and Eudoxia (under Theodosius II) lies in their recognition as bearers of male children.[13]

Chastity is the single most outstanding characteristic of novel protagonists and is also of vital importance to the integrity of female martyrs. The word *sôphrosynê* goes through an important change in meaning by the time of the novels. North (1966) reports that through the Classical period *sôphrosynê* means ‘self-restraint’ applicable to any activity. Though her study passes over the Hellenistic and Imperial periods to patristic literature, during that time *sôphrosynê* comes to mean specifically ‘chastity’ in the sense of sexual self-restraint. Although chastity is a fundamental social principle generally throughout Greco-Roman antiquity, this adjustment in vocabulary complements the shift in emphasis to the personal from the institutional that starts in the Hellenistic period. According to Durkheim this changeover from the collective to the individual affects the way people perceive how their networks operate.[14] That is, people turn to personal contacts rather than bureaucracies to do business. Thus we find that personal ideals can come to have political influence. For instance, the empress Pulcheria, sister to Theodosius II, secures her own political power by practicing virginity and affiliating herself personally with the Virgin Mary. To challenge Pulcheria’s authority is to doubt the Virgin Mary, and none of her political opponents dare to do this.[15]

Laws in late antiquity generally support social institutions such as marriage and family, which are the foundation of a stable society. Enforcement of female chastity ensures the clarity of patrilineal inheritance. Augustus’ laws on compulsory marriage prevail until the fourth century, at which time Constantine introduces more strictures prohibiting or discouraging interclass marriage. Marriage is inescapable for elite young women during the Principate.[16] Even after the advent of Christian ‘house monasticism’ in the fourth century, Christian couples practice abstinence in marriages.[17] Melania the Younger

---

[13] Holum (1982) 30, 66-73.
[14] Durkheim (1960) 353-73.
[15] Holum (1982) 145.
[16] Arjava (1996) 81-2.
[17] Clark (1984) 94.

has such an arrangement with her spouse, although he does extract from her a promise to have two children before they forego sex.[18] While a man is allowed to 'play the field' with prostitutes, concubines or slaves before and after marriage, the same license is not permitted a woman, as it handicaps her parents' ability to find her an agreeable spouse. After she catches the naughty heroine with a man in her bedroom, Leukippe's mother exclaims, 'You've ruined all I ever hoped for, Leukippe! Better you were a wartime atrocity, better raped by a victorious Thracian soldier than this. This way you lose your reputation along with your happiness' (Ach. Tat., *Leucippe and Clitophon* 2.24).[19] Consequently, the burden of legitimacy for a couple's children and for their relationship lies on the woman. A man's extramarital affairs would jeopardize neither the status of his legal children nor his right to maintain his marriage, whereas a woman convicted of adultery would ruin her marriage, destroy the social ties created therein, and call into question her children's right to their inheritance. Women in late antiquity are responsible for holding together their families and, in a larger sense, society.

Thus violation of a woman's chastity—especially an elite woman's—threatens not only her family's integrity and her own reputation but also the fabric of society itself. Callirhoe and her fellow heroines not only fight for their own safety and happiness but also struggle symbolically for the survival of elite Greco-Roman society and culture in the face of all opposition.[20] Their success at their spectacular trials signifies a victory for their class.[21] Most heroines,

---

[18] Gerontius, *Life of Melania the Younger*, 2-4.

[19] Translation from Winkler (1989) 201.

[20] Swain (1996) 112-13 suggests that this focus upon and triumph of elite Greek values arise from a desire among the Hellenic urban elite to see their own social or ethical concerns given center stage. Haynes (2002) reads the symbolic Hellenic cultural superiority of the heroines to be in tension with their subversive tendency to appropriate the male power of eloquence and thus to destabilize marriage as a symbol of political stability; Haynes codes this as a provocative Greek response to Roman domination. This makes an interesting comparison with the female martyrs, who are liberated from male subjectivity in a way of which none of the heroines could conceive. While the heroines may display an ambivalence toward patriarchal society, it is to this society that they eventually choose and even aspire to return. The female martyrs however permanently abandon their native society. And though the divine society to which they migrate may replicate the patriarchal structure of the one they forsook, these martyrs manage to carve special places for themselves within this system.

[21] See above, n. 10.

with the exception of Chloe who knows no better, realize that their virginity and chastity are a sort of social capital and use them to bargain for their fates and manipulate others. Heliodorus' heroine Charikleia uses her maidenhead as bait for a number of men (including the hero Theagenes!) to persuade them to perform her bidding.[22] Anthia in Xenophon's novel claims to hold sacred vows of chastity which she shames her potential rapists into respecting.[23] Even Achilles Tatius, who I have elsewhere argued parodies the morality of the romances and criticizes this ancient value, in the end validates the worthiness of chastity by having his heroine arrive at the altar virginal in body if not in mind.[24]

Violence towards novel heroes does not threaten social boundaries in the same way. Male conduct or men's personal experience has no bearing on the social institutions of marriage and family.[25] Men's legitimacy, worth and power *are* threatened through their women. In Butler's (1993) terms women are the phalluses which men have and which they constantly fear losing control or possession of. Thus the woman is the locus of vulnerability, both in the family and in society. This is why the heroines are the focus and emotional centers of the novels. Theagenes might have to wrestle a bull and an Ethiopian champion to prove his mettle for Charikleia, but Charikleia's chastity guarantees the ultimate salvation and security of them both.

For the early Christians the relation between the body and society is more complex. Brown (1988) discerns two distinct stages in the development of early Christian ideology: a subversive stage when early Christianity first challenges the values of dominant Greco-Roman society and a constructive stage when early Christianity begins to dominate and establish its program. Most martyrdom belongs to the first period. In this early period Christians express their rejection of Greco-Roman values and that secular society by striving for entrance into the next world. They treat with disdain social institutions which support Greco-Roman civilization such as marriage and family.[26] The body, which becomes a distasteful thing for later Chris-

[22] Heliodorus, *Aithiopika* 4.18, 5.26.
[23] Xenophon Ephesius, *Ephesiaka* 3.11, 5.4.
[24] Chew (2000).
[25] Arjava (1996) 193-203.
[26] This explains why we possess fewer accounts of matron or motherly martyrs, who through bearing children (unwittingly) participated in perpetuating the sort of society that early Christianity sought to dissolve.

tians under the new influence of asceticism, is judged neutrally by these very early Christians as a temporary vessel, worthy of respect inasmuch as it is a creation of God and an ephemeral home for the soul. Suffering becomes a way for Christians to participate in their religion and an opportunity to prove devotion to God. This is in stark contrast to Greco-Roman culture, which views suffering as something to ignore or avoid if possible – thus the Stoic motto 'endure and refrain.'[27]

Christians of this early period however embrace suffering as a way to participate in their religion and as an opportunity to prove devotion to God. Thus secular violence does not necessarily distress them. The martyrs' immaculate state is both an irresistible challenge to Greco-Roman culture and a personal declaration of their higher calling. They occupy a liminal position, which traditionally confers a certain authority upon its inhabitants, and this empowers them. Menodora actually encourages her inquisitor to torture her, and when he later exhibits Menodora's bloody, broken and rotting corpse to terrorize her companions into submission, they instead react as if they were at their sister's nuptial chamber and express great joy and excitement (*PG* 115: 657 and *AASS* 10 Sept.). Menodora's spiritual power is represented by her chastity and she uses this to obtain her heart's desire, martyrdom. The martyr's death is a paradoxical triumph both for the martyr, who achieves the highest expression of her faith, and for her persecutor, who dispatches a criminal.[28] Sexual purity signifies women's distance from the material world, their rejection of Greco-Roman society and their closeness to God and defines their identity as Christians. Pagan officials treat the martyrs' chastity as the key to their resistance and always focus their attacks here. For instance, Agatha possesses all the attributes of a novel heroine—beauty, wealth, and class—but as a Christian she embraces virginity and practices chastity. A lustful consular official attempts to weaken Agatha's resolve by confining her with a procuress and her nine sluttish daughters for a month to no avail and then directs his other tortures at her sexual characteristics, such as twisting off her breast, until she gives up her spirit (*PG* 114: 1331-46 and *AASS*, 2 Feb.).

---

[27] Perkins (1995) 77-103.
[28] Bowersock (1995) 42-3.

What makes these women a special target for violence is the apparent vulnerability of their virginity or chastity. Rape can destroy a woman's self-respect, leading her to believe that she is unfit for both man and God. To breach this barrier attacks Christianity not only at a secular, social level but also at a spiritual one, and thus is potentially more devastating. As male virginity has no social or political significance in Greco-Roman society, it consequently holds a secondary place in the novels to the heroine's chastity. For instance, when in Heliodorus' novel the hero Theagenes steps on the gridiron and thereby proves his virginity, the crowd of spectators is impressed (θαυμασθείς 10.9.1) that such a good looking young man is innocent of sexual relations; this reaction has no moral undertones of approval – one gets the impression that, had Theagenes failed this test, this would have met the crowd's expectations. Theagenes' virginity does strengthen his candidacy for his suit of Charikleia, but it is by no means his *sine qua non* as a hero.[29] In the same way, virginity is thus less determinative for male martyrs. So this physical advantage in spirituality for women is also their greatest liability. Both heroines and martyrs share a sort of social vulnerability – that is, the precarious condition of chastity – which not only gives them inner strength but also makes them prone to attack.[30]

Thus it is not surprising to find that most violence against both heroines and martyrs is either directly sexual or implies a sexual metaphor. Loss of virginity or chastity is the greatest threat to both groups of women and jeopardizes the stability of their respective societies. Novel authors and hagiographers construct these sexual situations in a dramatic way that captivates readers but never crosses a certain line. Heroines and martyrs endure all sorts of titillating tortures that function as foreplay for the ultimate consummation, which torturers are never able to perform. This act is reserved for heroes or God, and always occurs modestly 'off-camera.'[31] Thus virtuous read-

[29] Achilles Tatius points up the foolishness of worrying about male virginity when his hero Kleitophon, who has just enjoyed a secret tryst with the femme fatale Melite (5.26-7), wittily reassures the heroine Leucippe's father that "if one can speak of such a thing as male virginity, this is [his] relationship to Leucippe up to now" (8.5); translation from Winkler (1989) 271.

[30] Brock and Harvey (1987) 24 observe how women's sexuality is used to denote the moral extremes of purity and perdition.

[31] In general, a martyr's modesty is often preserved by miraculous means. If she is ordered to be stripped, either her hair grows and covers her (Agnes, *AASS*, 21 Jan.), God provides her with some sort of cloak (Juliana, *PG* 116: 313-4) or her clothes be-

ers can allow themselves the thrill of enjoying these tales without guilt because all's well that ends well, does it not?

Metaphoric sexual violence is sensational and plays on notions of woman's vanity and the seeming fragility of her beauty; women's genitals and female characteristics are often mutilated with phallic-shaped instruments. For instance, Charikleia suffers a vicarious rape when a brigand substitutes intercourse with his sword for the real thing (Hld., *Aithiopica* 1.30-1); lucky for her, the brigand grabs the wrong girl and our heroine escapes. Leukippe's abdomen is split from her genitals to her belly twice, once in her mother's dream and again by brigands (Ach. Tat., *Leucippe and Clitophon*, 2.23, 3.15); this last time proves later to have been a clever ruse. Though the saints' experiences are all much more colorful than the heroines', Leukippe prefigures the martyrs when she proclaims to her captors (*ibid.* 6.21): 'Bring on the instruments of torture: the wheel – here, take my arms and stretch them; the whips – here is my back, lash away; the hot irons – here is my body for burning; bring the axe as well – here is my neck, slice through! Watch a new contest: a single woman competes with all the engines of torture and wins every round.'[32]

Leukippe's observation is well taken. Preservation of chastity is a source of pride for female characters, something which sets them apart as individuals. The heroines proclaim to the heroes and the world their valiant success in warding off improper sexual advances. Martyr accounts serve a similar purpose in testifying to a martyr's impeccable conduct and thorough adherence to Christian principles. But where martyrology aims to emphasize the martyr's disjunction from ancient society, novels conclude by healing the rift between the lovers and their society. Consequently novel heroines exchange their chaste reputation for re-entry into elite society, which effectively undercuts their independence. Female martyrs, on the other hand, win a sort of prestige that cannot be touched on earth; they depart from this

come stuck to her skin (Anastasia Junior *PG* 116: 585-6). The one exception I have encountered is the martyr Eugenia (*PG* 116: 633-4), who combines many of the saint types: she is a virgin, transvestite monk, who is accused by a woman of seduction; to prove her innocence, she bares her genitals, to the astonishment of her fellow monks. Interestingly, in cases where a martyr is successfully stripped, her nakedness does not shame her, nor is there any description of its effect on spectators (Agatha, *PG* 114: 1331-46 and *AASS*, 5 Feb).

[32] Translation from Winkler (1989) 259.

world not only with their virginity intact but with their self-worth as well. Such potential for female achievement does not last long.

So martyrs see their suffering as a contest for the rewards of their faith. Usually the inquisitor is also a spurned suitor and compensates for his nuptial loss with highly eroticized torture. Anastasia's inquisitor rips off her clothes, roasts and beats her body, cuts off her breasts, tears out her nails and knocks out all her teeth; finally, Anastasia meets her martyrdom by a sword (*PG* 115: 1293-1308). Euphemia emerges unscathed from attempts at rape and then at gang-rape. The judge then hangs her up by her hair and martyrs her with a sword (*PG* 115: 713-32 and *AASS*, 16 Sept.). Violence clearly substitutes for a sex act. The connection between violence and sexuality returns us to my original question of why violence is so necessary to these narratives.

Each of these literatures is concerned with promoting the values of its respective culture and society. Sexuality plays a very important role in this, and rules for sexuality safeguard the preservation of each society. For the Greco-Romans these rules center on protecting marriage, family and other socially involving institutions. Attacking the sexual code of a society is a sure way to cripple that society. Violence indicates social disorder, according to Durkheim.[33] Social disorder differs in significance for the two relevant groups here. Novel texts express anxiety that their society's way of life is threatened, and locate the source of that disorder in elements outside the boundaries of their society. Martyr accounts on the other hand seek to disrupt the order of dominant Greco-Roman society so that a Christian world order can prevail. In their respective texts violence challenges the world order of each society so that the members of that society, represented symbolically by heroines and martyrs, can exhibit their commitment to their ideals. In their triumph over that violence, each woman reinforces for her community its power and right to hegemony. One is conservative and the other subversive, but both ideologies recognize the fundamental role of women in social stability and both use violence against women as a proscribed but ennobling act. This social explanation is an important factor for understanding violence against women in literature, though of course I acknowledge that there are other factors.

---

[33] Durkheim (1960) 70.

Chastity ceases to be an avenue to power for women when early Christianity begins to establish itself as a social institution in *this* world rather than in the next one. Christian women are subsumed into an increasingly hierarchical and political system which shares many of the fundamental attitudes of Greco-Roman society, notably the inferior position of women. The perception that the weakness of women lies in their chastity is translated by Church Fathers like Chrysostom into the tenet that women's weakness is chastity.[34] This perception is the source of the ideological reforms of Christianity beginning in the fourth century which result in the subordination of female to male. Asceticism comes to supplant martyrdom as the ultimate expression of Christian faith, and its training focuses on the control of bodily desires and pleasure.[35] Sexuality becomes the link between body and soul,[36] and thus becomes a powerful means of controlling people, and a control to which women are particularly vulnerable. Female saints such as Melania the Younger inflict upon themselves all intensities of ascetic violence, seeking approval of God and of man. Christianity has an intrinsically agonistic nature, in that Christians cast their lives as a struggle against a common enemy. As the opponents of Christianity disappear from this world through conversion or attrition, the church's leaders promote new adversaries in the world beyond. Satan and his minions attack a Christian's ascetic resistance through psychological temptation focused on the body. Christians come to disdain the body, thus women's natural physiology and participation in birth and death runs to their disadvantage. Early Christian women internalize these androcentric standards and ironically fix the means to their spiritual goal in the flesh of asceticism rather than in the spirit of martyrdom.[37] Coon (1997) discerns at the heart of Christian asceticism the belief that women through their form are inherently alienated from God and must constantly battle their nature in order to merit communion with God. This is a battle which women of late antiquity cannot win, as long as the scales are tipped against them. It is also another sad irony that

[34] E.g. John Chrysostom, *De Virginitatibus* 46-7.

[35] Francis (1995) 181-9 explains monasticism as an institutional attempt to domesticate and incorporate Christianity's radical ascetic front. Such a development, I would argue, is especially significant for limiting the mobility and power of women.

[36] Brown (1988) 9-13 and (1990) *passim*.

[37] Elm (1994) vii-viii rightly points out that asceticism for women symbolized also a rejection of the traditional family model and an attempt to transform it.

more of the suffering women in late antiquity experience is self-inflicted.

But before asceticism gains momentum as a Christian world order emerges, in many ways the cultural patterns of Greco-Roman society repeat themselves among early Christian groups. In fact even after the church fathers discourage martyrdom in favor of more ascetic and non-fatal expressions of faith, stories of martyrs continue to win popularity and circulate through Europe, eventually in vernacular translations. The martyr account becomes a genre in its own right, and its roots in contemporary culture and its expression of Christian worldly discontent ensure its popular appeal. For martyrs, marriage to God is death of the self. For heroines, marriage is death of the self. What benefits from the sacrifices of each of these women is not the women themselves but the institutions which they support and which in the end fail them in nature, theory and practice.[38]

[38] I would like to thank Judith Perkins and David Konstan for their guidance and enthusiasm, and Maaike Zimmerman, Stelios Panayotakis, and Wytse Keulen for creating such a forum for stimulating discussion and for their helpful editorial comments.

THREE DEATH SCENES IN *APOLLONIUS OF TYRE*

Stelios Panayotakis

The anonymous Latin *Story of Apollonius, King of Tyre* (*Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri*) is commonly regarded as a type of popular romance that lacks the rhetorical figures and learned allusions of sophisticated romances, favours simple structure and paratactic style, and features characters without individuality. The story, which is transmitted in various versions, relates the adventures of the prince Apollonius, particularly the loss and recovery of his family, in a pagan world, and combines novelistic and folktale elements (such as incest, riddles, shipwrecks, and apparent death). The earliest extant versions of *Apollonius*, also known as recensions A and B, share prosimetric form and mixed style, as is showed by the coexistence of epic and Biblical phrases, archaisms and vulgarisms, poetical expressions and colloquialisms, grecisms and Late Latin constructions.

This coexistence in *Apollonius* of different literary and linguistic streams is usually taken as an indication of the interpolated and corrupt state of the text, and its transformation from a pagan into a Christian (or Christianised) tale in the hands of later redactors. For, although the earliest versions of this romance are in Latin, and may have been composed as late as the sixth century, it is argued that they ultimately derive from a lost original of the third century, which may have been written in Greek in a longer form. In the absence of cogent papyrological evidence, the questions about the language, length, and nature of the alleged original are still unresolved; equally controversial issues are the identification and importance of the Christian elements in the text, and the relation of *Apollonius* with its contemporary pagan and Christian literary tradition.[1]

[1] There is as yet no comprehensive study on the style and literary qualities of the earliest versions of *Apollonius of Tyre*. Thielmann (1881) and Klebs (1899) 228-93 are outdated, though still useful; synoptic treatments in Kortekaas (1984) 97-121; Schmeling (1996a) 538-40; Puche-Lopez (1999). Recent editions with different viewpoints of the text are Tsitsikli (1981); Kortekaas (1984); Schmeling (1988). Interpretative essays include Holzberg (1990); Archibald (1991); Konstan (1994) 100-13; Schmeling (1998); Kortekaas (1998); Robins (1995) and (2000). For the survey of papyrological evidence see Morgan (1998) 3354-6. I am currently preparing a commentary on the earliest version of the text, Panayotakis (forthcom.).

In this article I propose to discuss three passages from *Apollonius*, in which mention is made of physical violence against both low-life and highborn characters. My interest lies in the literary representation of violence (phraseology, context, characters) and its affinities with similar episodes from Late Latin narratives, which are written mainly but not exclusively by Christian authors. The rhetoric of violence in *Apollonius*, seen against the background of both Christian and non-Christian literary traditions, affects our understanding of the narrative technique and the characterisation in this allegedly unsophisticated text. This analysis is mainly focused on the earliest version of *Apollonius*, rec. A, which is acknowledged as the more overtly Christianised; references to rec. B, which is roughly contemporary and partly dependent on rec. A, will occasionally be made.

The Punishment of the Wicked

In *Apollonius of Tyre* evil characters that are potentially harmful to the heroes' life or chastity are eventually punished. Antiochus, the incestuous king of Antioch and Apollonius' arch-enemy, is miraculously put to death (A 24: 17.12-13 *rex saevissimus Antiochus cum filia sua concumbens, dei fulmine percussus est* "the most cruel King Antiochus has been struck by God's thunderbolt as he was lying in bed with his own daughter").[2] Presented as a result of divine punishment (*dei fulmine*),[3] Antiochus' death is briefly recounted in direct speech as part of the information the hero receives from a Tyrian helmsman. This news motivates Apollonius' ensuing journey and adventures, which include the apparent death of his wife, the treacherous conduct of his friends, Stranguillio and Dionysias, towards his daughter, Tarsia; the latter's abduction by pirates and her subsequent forced prostitution. When Apollonius is finally reunited with his allegedly lost daughter, he demands justice for the wrongs she suffered at the hands of the greedy brothel-keeper and the treacherous couple, who were Tarsia's foster-parents during Apollonius' long absence in Egypt. In the island of Lesbos Apollonius has the pimp arrested and

[2] Passages from *Apollonius* are quoted from the edition of Schmeling (1988). References indicate recension, and chapter, page, and line number(s). Translations from rec. A are by Archibald (1991) 112-79.

[3] Instances of divine or providential punishment in ancient fiction are discussed by Sandy (1994) 1534-9.

executed (ch. 46), and at the city of Tarsus he takes revenge on Stranguillio and Dionysias (ch. 50). Unlike the death of Antiochus, which is briefly reported and explained through reference to the supernatural, the punishment of Tarsia's offenders is effected by earthly authorities (the characters Athenagoras and Apollonius) and is vividly dramatised with realistic details of time, place and action. These death scenes[4] form a pair that features the deserved punishment of Apollonius' enemies, and are appropriately juxtaposed with another pair of episodes, which also come from the final part of the narrative, and contain the rewards of Apollonius' helpers, a fisherman and a citizen from Tarsus (ch. 51).[5] As I shall argue below, both death scenes present lexical and thematic resemblance with similar episodes from the *Acts of the Christian Martyrs* and the Latin versions of the Bible. Given the possible Christian background of the author of *Apollonius* (as Hexter [1988] 188 argues), they may have been fashioned after well-known literary representations of undeserved violence against Jews and Christians.[6]

Burning Alive

The punishment of the greedy and cruel brothel-keeper, who bought Tarsia at the slave market of Mytilene and forced her to work at his brothel, is exacted at the market place of that city. The presence of a big crowd, while underlining the theatrical character of the event, is justified, for the safety of the city is at stake. The pimp is led to the market place with his hands tied behind his back; Apollonius, dressed in full royal attire, presides on a great platform (A 46: 38.12-23). These elements are combined to create the impression of a public trial, although there is no indication of a formal procedure; the brothel-keeper is *a priori* considered guilty and he is not heard defend-

[4] The term 'scene' is used in the sense of "a series of events occupying the same location without narrative interruption" (Lowe [2000] 42). See also Hägg (1971) 87-9; Lowe (2000) 40.

[5] On the arrangement of these episodes see Schmeling (1996a) 525.

[6] Here and elsewhere in this article I refer to the 'author' of *Apollonius of Tyre,* although I am aware that the notion of authorial control is highly problematic when applied to anonymous texts that do not have a fixed manuscript tradition; see Konstan (1998) and Thomas (1998) on this topic. However, throughout the earliest version of *Apollonius* there are clear signs of stylistic homogeneity and artful composition, which reveal that this text, regardless of its origins, was the careful work of a single authorial/editorial hand.

ing himself at all. Athenagoras, the prince of the city, exercises his authority and asks the people of Mytilene to punish the pimp in order to appease the wrath of Apollonius. The crowd unites in lynching the accused brothel-keeper (A 46: 39.5-7):

> *At vero omnes una voce clamaverunt dicentes: "leno vivus ardeat et bona omnia eius puellae addicantur!" atque his dictis leno igni est traditus.*
>
> But they all cried out with one voice: "Let the pimp be burned alive, and let all his wealth be awarded to the girl!" At these words, the pimp was consigned to the flames.

The narrative situation in which a freeborn girl is kidnapped and sold to a brothel-keeper occurs already in Roman comedy,[7] in which the character of the disreputable *leno* suffers both verbal and physical abuse once the recognition between the lost daughter and her father takes place. In comedy, however, the pimp, although threatened, abused and outwitted (cf. Plaut. *Persa* 857 *spectatores, bene valete. leno periit: plaudite* "spectators, fare ye well. A pimp has perished. Give us your applause" transl. P. Nixon, Loeb), never suffers the death penalty and occasionally is forgiven by the captive maidens themselves on account of his lenient behaviour towards them![8] On the other hand, the author's concept of justice and retaliation as well as the conventions of the genre require a different, more dramatic handling of the offender *leno* in *Apollonius of Tyre*.

Being burned alive (in literary and legal sources, *crematio* or *vivicomburium*) is an old Roman penalty, and the *Twelve Tables* authorise it for a man who commits arson (*Digest* 47.9.9) – a case of *talio*. This form of punishment becomes common during the Roman Empire but is extended to various crimes—these include homicide and sacrilege—whereas legal and literary evidence suggest that it mainly applied to slaves, free *humiliores*, and Christians. The recurrent terminology attested for this penalty in legal sources and literary texts is

---

[7] For the literary motif of female chastity endangered at a brothel see Panayotakis (2002) 106-12 with references; also Den Boeft, Bremmer (1991) 118-19; Bremmer (2000) 23.

[8] For verbal and physical abuse leveled at *lenones* see e.g. Plaut. *Persa* 809-20, 845-55. The pimp escapes unpunished in Plaut. *Curc.* 697-8; *Pseud.* 1402-8. On penalties for forced prostitution of freeborn and slave women in legal evidence see Robinson (1995) 69-70.

vivum uri (*comburi, exuri*) and *igni necari.*[9] The phrase *vivus ardeat,* employed in the death scene in *Apollonius* and found in both its recensions (AB 46) closely deserves our attention, for it deviates from the familiar legal/literary tradition.

This phrase in the form of an utterance elsewhere features in Latin texts from the end of the fourth century AD, and, as in *Apollonius,* is usually put in the mouth of an angry crowd (or an individual that expresses the opinion of a crowd). Ammianus Marcellinus reports that common people of Antioch expressed their hostility towards the emperor Valens with these ominous words (31.1.2 *vivus ardeat Valens* "let Valens be burned alive" transl. J.C. Rolfe, Loeb). The *Historia Monachorum,* a fifth century text, which is probably a compilation and translation of Greek sources, and the authorship of which is partly attributed to Rufinus, contains a scene of mob violence against a pretentious Manichaean exposed by the monk Copres.[10] The crowd drives the Manichaean violently out of the city with the cry "let the deceiver be burned alive" (*Hist. Monach.* 9.7.15 *vivus ardeat seductor*). In Italian hagiography of the sixth century (*Passio Alexandri (papae), Eventii, Theoduli, Hermetis et Quirini* [*BHL* 266]) the exclamation *vivus ardeat* expresses the anti-Christian feelings of a raging crowd (*Pass. Alex. et al.* 1.2 *vivus ardeat Alexander ... Hermes debet vivus incendi* "let Alexander be burned alive ... Hermes should be burned alive"). It is important to stress here that, unlike the situation in *Apollonius of Tyre,* in these contexts the utterance is just an indication of hostility, while the threat it contains remains actually unfulfilled. This threat is realised in early Christian narrative texts.

The earliest instances of the phrase *vivum ardere* are attested, as far as I know, in Christian texts that date from the late second cent. AD, and include the Old Latin Bible, Tertullian's *Apology* and the *Passion of Perpetua and Felicitas*. The context in the latter passages is the execution of Christians during the persecutions. Tertullian refers to the staged execution of a Christian man who, dressed as Hercules, suffers the death of the mythical hero (*Apol.* 15 *et qui vivus ardebat, Herculem induerat* "and a man, who was being burned

---

[9] For the penalty of *vivicomburium,* its terminology and frequency among the less privileged classes see Garnsey (1970) 125-6; MacMullen (1990) 209; Cantarella (1991) 223-37; Bauman (1996) 67-8; Kyle (1998) 53, 171-2. For burning as form of lynching, Bremmer (1998) 13-14.

[10] See Schulz-Flügel (1990) 3-5, 32-48.

alive, had been rigged out as Hercules" transl. T.R. Glover, Loeb).[11] The *Passion of Perpetua and Felicitas* exists in both Latin and Greek versions—priority is now accorded to the Latin version, although the Greek one, a translation, preserves valuable readings—and consists of authentic accounts of the martyrs and few editorial additions. The phrase in question occurs in the authentic account of the vision of Perpetua's fellow prisoner Saturus (11.9 *ibi invenimus Iocundum et Saturninum et Artaxium, qui eadem persecutione vivi arserunt* "and there we met Jucundus, Saturninus, and Artaxius, who were burnt alive in the same persecution" transl. Musurillo).[12] The corresponding passage in the Greek version oddly mentions hanging, not burning, of the Christians (ζῶντας κρεμασθέντας), a detail which led scholars to doubt the accuracy of the Greek version.[13] The phrase *vivum* / *vivos ardere* occurs in a similar context in the *Acts of the Christian Martyrs* (e.g. *Passion of Fructuosus* [*BHL* 3196] 2.4) and usually corresponds to the Greek terms ζῶντα / ζῶντας (κατα)καυθῆναι, which are commonly found in these texts (*Martyrdom of Pionius* 20.6).[14]

The employment of *vivum ardere* is further attested in both the Old Latin and the Vulgate versions of the Bible: *Lev.* 20.14 (Aug. *spec.* 2; Vulg.) *qui supra uxorem filiam duxerit matrem eius ... vivus ardebit cum eis* "if a man takes a wife and her mother also ... they shall be burned to death, both he and they" transl. Metzger, Murphy; and in sepulchral inscriptions (Africa; *CIL* VIII.1 11825 = Inscr. 8181 Dessau *qui me commuserit, / habebit deos iratos et / vivus ardebit* "he who removes my body, shall have the gods angered and shall be burned alive"). However, in the latter passages the phrase is

---

[11] For staged deaths in the Roman empire see Robert (1968) 281-3 (= 1989, 554-5); Coleman (1990); Potter (1993) 66-7; Kyle (1998) 54-5.

[12] For the issue of authenticity of the Latin version and the visions of Perpetua and Saturus see Bremmer (2002) 81-6 and (2003) with extensive references.

[13] Franchi de' Cavalieri (1896) *ad loc.* "aut participium κρεμασθέντας corruptum ex κατακαυθέντας, aut post ζῶντας verba nonnulla exciderunt qualia ἐν πυρί"; also *idem* (1896) 74-6 (=1962, 86-8). On the other hand, Amat (1996) 60 and 235 defends the transmitted text.

[14] See Franchi de' Cavalieri (1896) 76 note 1 = (1962) 88 note 1, and (1935) 145 for the Greek and Latin expressions. But cf. *Acta Carpi, Papyli et Agathonices* 36 ὁ ἀνθύπατος ... κελεύει αὐτοὺς ζῶντας καῆναι "the proconsul ... ordered them to be burned alive" (transl. Musurillo) and the Latin version of this text: *proconsul ... iussit eos uiuos incendi* (4.1).

used to express an imminent threat or a malediction, rather than to describe a death scene.[15]

As I mentioned above, the earliest occurrences of *vivum ardere* associate it with violent death scenes of Christians during the persecutions. Among those death scenes is the execution of a celebrated figure that is reported to have died in flames amidst the shouts of the crowd, namely Polycarp, the bishop of Smyrna (middle of the second century). Of the martyrdom of the bishop of Smyrna we have two Latin versions, one made probably after the Greek Martyrdom, and dated to the third century (*BHL* 6870; see Dehandschutter [1993] 489-90), and the other given by Rufinus in his translation of Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History* (composed in 402/403). It is instructive to compare the passage that describes the crowd of Smyrna calling for the death of the respected Christian bishop Polycarp, with the passage in *Apollonius of Tyre* in which the crowd of Mytilene calls for the death of an infamous and nameless pimp, a worshipper of Priapus (A 33). The passage in question reads almost identical in the version of the Greek Martyrdom and the one given by Eusebius:

> τότε ἔδοξεν αὐτοῖς ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐπιβοῆσαι, ὥστε τὸν Πολύκαρπον ζῶντα κατακαυθῆναι (Martyr. Polycarp. 12.3)
>
> τότε ἔδοξεν αὐτοῖς ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐπιβοῆσαι, ὥστε ζῶντα τὸν Πολύκαρπον κατακαῦσαι (Euseb. *hist. eccl.* 3.27)

Both Latin versions, on the other hand, contain *vivum ardere*, but the version of Rufinus follows a construction closer to the one found in *Apollonius*:

> *tunc placuit illis omnibus aequo unoque consensu, ut vivum Polycarpum ignis arderet* (Pass. Polycarp. 12.3)
>
> *tunc illi omnes pariter conclamarunt, ut Polycarpus vivus arderet* (Rufin. *hist.* 4.15.27)

Rufinus' account of the death of Polycarp verbally resembles in detail the account of the death of the nameless pimp in *Apollonius of Tyre* (*illi omnes pariter* ~ *omnes una voce, conclamarunt* ~ *clamaverunt, ut ... vivus arderet* ~ *vivus ardeat*). Moreover, in both scenes

[15] A similar point is made by MacMullen (1990) 212 and 361 note 40 about mutilation as a judicial penalty and as part of imprecations in late antiquity.

the demand for the specific mode of execution comes from the attending crowd.[16]

That the death scenes of pagan characters in *Apollonius of Tyre* are phrased just as those of Christian martyrs in early and later Christian texts, could also be supported by the passive construction *leno igni traditus est*. This construction too, commonly found in post-Constantinian texts on martyrs, may point to the direction of a martyr's death (cf. the Ambrosian Hymn 14.13-14 *traduntur igni martyres / et bestiarum dentibus*). For instance, the same words are found in Rufinus' account of the death of the presbyter Metrodorus (*hist.* 4.15.46 *refertur post Polycarpum quod etiam Metrodorus ... igni sit traditus*), and in Jerome's brief account of the death of Polycarp in his work *On illustrious men* 17.4 (written in 392/393):

> *Postea uero regnante Marco Antonino et Lucio Aurelio Commodo, quarta post Neronem persecutione, Smyrnae sedente proconsule et uniuerso populo in amphitheatro aduersus eum personante, igni traditus est* (sc. *Polycarpus*).
>
> Later on, in the reign of Marcus Antoninus and Lucius Aurelius Commodus, during the fourth persecution after Nero, at Smyrna, before the proconsul seated in judgement and the whole people in the amphitheater howling against him, he was burned alive (transl. Halton).

The acknowledgement of a shared language in texts that allegedly derive from entirely different traditions may have important implications for our appreciation of the literary character and method of composition of these Late Latin narratives.

Death by Stoning

A platform is set in the market of the city of Tarsus, and Stranguillio and Dionysias are arrested and brought before Apollonius who presides. As in the previous scene, a large crowd is attending the trial. Apollonius first asks Stranguillio and Dionysias the truth concerning the loss of his daughter, and when they persist in their lies, he accuses them of both attempted murder and perjury. Then, in the light of undisputed evidence, the guilty woman confesses, and the crowd takes justice in its own hands (A 50: 41.26-42.17). Stranguillio and

[16] For crowds in early Christian texts, see Lanata (1973) 108; Ascough (1996) 72-80; Matsumoto (1988); Waldner (2000); Bremmer (2001) 81.

Dionysias are carried outside the city, stoned to death and thrown on the land, their corpses destined to feed the animals and the birds (A 50: 42.17-21):

> *Tunc omnes cives—sub testificatione confessione facta et addita vera ratione—confusi rapientes Stranguillionem et Dionysiadem tulerunt extra civitatem et lapidibus eos occiderunt {et ad bestias terrae et volucres caeli in campo iactaverunt, ut etiam corpora eorum terrae sepulturae negarentur}.*
>
> After this evidence, when a confession had been made and the true account had been given too, the citizens rushed together, seized Stranguillio and Dionysias, took them outside the city, stoned them to death, and threw their bodies on the ground for the beasts of the earth and birds of the air, so as also to deny their corpses burial in the earth.

The execution of the evil Dionysias and her accomplice Stranguillio is given detailed attention in recension A. In recension B the length and style of the account is considerably modified: *Tunc cives omnes rapuerunt Stranguillionem et Dionysiadem et extra civitatem lapidaverunt* (B 50: 81.26-7).

Death by stoning as a form of punishment is amply attested in ancient sources, and features as common form of lynching among Greeks, Jews, and Romans.[17] Indeed, this form of mob violence is at hand here, although the setting of the episode (market place) and the sequence of events (interrogation and confession) vaguely suggest a public trial.[18] The angry crowd present at the trial unites and inflicts the punishment upon Stranguillio and Dionysias. The violent reaction of the crowd establishes social order and restores balance in the relation between the citizens of Tarsus and their benefactor Apollonius. The scene deserves close analysis for its rhetorical flavour, as it constitutes an example of the complex coexistence of different literary traditions in *Apollonius*, and their reception among modern scholars.

At the end of the nineteenth century Elimar Klebs wrote a monumental study on the Latinity and afterlife of *Apollonius of Tyre*, in which he firmly argued that, in order to reconstitute a Latin pagan original narrative, one needs to free the text from passages of a Bibli-

---

[17] For the evidence on the penalty of death by stoning among Greeks, Jews and Romans, and its place in cultural and legal contexts see Pease (1907); Hirzel (1909); Fehling (1974) 59-79; Gras (1984); Cantarella (1991) 73-87, 326-9, 367 note 18.

[18] For the *forum* as setting of public trials and judicial violence see Hinard (1987) 116-19; MacMullen (1990) 210-11; Riess (2002) 210 note 22.

cal character. Accordingly, Klebs proposed to bracket the latter part of the passage we are discussing on account of its obvious similarity with Biblical passages such as Vulg. *Ier.* 7.33 *et erit morticinum populi huius in cibum volucribus caeli et bestiis terrae* "the corpses of this people will be food for the birds of the air, and for the animals of the earth." Among editors Schmeling (1988) alone adopts the suggestion of Klebs. Indeed, the elaborate phrase *volucres caeli et bestiae terrae* (or similar ones) often occurs in the Old Testament with reference to the punishment of God's enemies (see e.g. *Ezech.* 29.5; *I reg.* 17.46). However, it is clearly only the verbal similarity that led scholars to consider the passage an interpolation. For the image of unburied corpses devoured by beasts and birds occurs as early as Homer (*Iliad* 1.4-5; *Odyssey* 3.259-60), and forms a familiar detail in literary descriptions of executions from early Roman history (Dion. Hal. 20.16 ὑπὸ οἰωνῶν καὶ κυνῶν διεφθάρησαν).[19] Thus, the issue of Christian additions that need to be extracted is presented in terms of form rather than content.

To illustrate how problematic this approach of the text can be, one may point to yet another phrase in the same death scene, which, in spite of its possible Biblical background, escaped Klebs' attention. The guilty Stranguillio and Dionysias are driven outside the city to meet their death, and this detail is phrased *extra civitatem*, thus found in both recensions. The location for the punishment of the guilty couple is significant and chosen apparently with an eye to the protection of the city from the pollution of murder. This notion is attested well in ancient literary representations of death by stoning among Greeks and Jews.[20] Both this concept and the phrasing *extra civitatem* occur in two famous Biblical death scenes, which involve death by stoning, and centre around the figures of men maliciously charged with blasphemy. These are found in the story of Naboth's vineyard (Vulg. *III reg.* 21.13 *eduxerunt eum extra civitatem et lapidibus interfecerunt* "they took him outside the city and stoned him to death"), and in the account of the trial and death of Saint Stephen "the first of all martyrs" (Vulg. *act.* 7.57 *et impetum fecerunt unanimiter in eum*

---

[19] See Hinard (1987) 113-14. For instances of this epic detail in Roman poetry and fiction see Lazzarini (1986) 150; Kyle (1998) 168.

[20] See e.g. Herodot. 1.167 ἐξαγαγόντες κατέλευσαν. Relevant phrases are: πρὸ τῆς πόλεως, ἔξω τῶν ὅρων, ἔξω τῆς πόλεως, *extra urbem*. See Hirzel (1909) 244-5 (= [1967] 22-3). On the topic, in general, see Pabón (2002).

et eicientes eum extra civitatem lapidabant "they all rushed together against him. Then they dragged him out of the city and began to stone him").[21] Scenes of punishment or execution of Christians by stoning, which repeat the detail "outside the city" occur elsewhere in the *Acts of the Apostles* (14.18) and in Passions of martyrs (Latin version of the *Passion of Peter, Paul, Andrew and Dionysia* [*BHL* 6716] 4; *Acts of Maximus* [*BHL* 5829] 2).[22] In other words, one should reconsider either the extent of the interpolation or the function of the Biblical details in the passage as a whole. The passage describing the execution of the treacherous couple in *Apollonius* forms an artful unity in terms of style and action (*tulerunt, occiderunt, iactaverunt*). However, this death scene is by no means intended as a verbal reproduction of exclusively Biblical episodes. The expression *lapidibus occidi* is rare, and indeed not used in the Bible. It is particularly favoured in Late Latin historiography and in death scenes of officials or other people, who, like Stranguillio and Dionysias, are punished for their *crudelitas* or *saevitia* (e.g. *Vir. ill.* 69.4; Oros. *hist.* 5.18.22).

The evidence presented above suggests that the author of *Apollonius of Tyre* is highly aware of the Late Latin literary tradition, and that he communicates with both Biblical and other, non Christian, literary texts in a way that shows freedom from any preconception about opposition and contrast of those traditions. Yet, one should also acknowledge the striking effect of the combination in a single death scene of elements from different traditions. *Extra civitatem* is mainly associated with the executions of slandered Jews and Christians, whereas *ad bestias terrae et volucres caeli* and *lapidibus occidi* with the deserved punishment of cruel and impious 'pagans.'

The Death of a Virgin

The passage I propose to examine next, unlike the previous ones, does not involve a physical death but an irretrievable loss, and comes

[21] On the death of Stephen see Bowersock (1995) 75-6; Watson (1996) 62.

[22] Moreover, one could argue that the phrase *sedens pro tribunali in foro adduci sibi illos praecepit* (A 50) evokes scenes of public trials of Christians presided by Roman magistrates. Compare Vulg. *Act.* 25.6 *altera die sedit pro tribunali et iussit Paulum adduci*; ibid. 25.17 *sequenti die sedens pro tribunali iussit adduci virum*; Pass. Iulian. 12 (*Marcianus praeses*) *cumque sedisset in tribunali in foro, iubet beatum Iulianum et reliquos sanctos exhiberi*; see also Robert (1994) 107-8; Bremmer (2000) 34. But the phrase *sedere pro tribunali* is of course not confined to Christian texts; see Liv. 39.32.10; Plin. *epist.* 1.10.9; Suet. *Vesp.* 7.2.

from the very beginning of the narrative. Nor does it involve the punishment of guilty people; it focuses, instead, on the offence committed upon an innocent person. It is my intention to investigate possible verbal links between this passage and Late Latin hagiography, and therefore to examine whether or not the affinities between episodes from *Apollonius* and death scenes from the Christian literary tradition should be understood in terms of verbal resemblance alone. At the beginning of *Apollonius*, the king Antiochus is shown to fall in love with his own daughter. Without much restraint he rapes her. The princess' nurse, who later enters the scene of the rape, notices the stains of the virgin's blood on the floor and the girl's blushing face (A 2: 1.18-2.2):

> *Subito nutrix eius introivit cubiculum. Vt uidit puellam flebili vultu, asperso pauimento sanguine, roseo rubore perfusam, ait: "Quid sibi vult iste turbatus animus?" Puella ait: "Cara nutrix, modo hoc in cubiculo duo nobilia perierunt nomina."*
>
> Suddenly her nurse came into the bedroom. When she saw the girl blushing scarlet, her face wet with tears and the floor spattered with blood, she asked: "What is the meaning of this distress?" The girl said: "Dear nurse, just now in this bedroom two noble reputations have perished."

The irretrievable loss of virginity is in this passage manifested through the red colour, which appears both in the stains of blood on the floor, and on the rosy blushing face of the deflowered princess (*roseo rubore perfusam*). The girl's blushing expresses both her feeling of shame, and her awareness of her exposure in the eyes of her nurse; simultaneously it illustrates the complexity of the literary texture of this episode. Klebs already pointed out that the phrase *roseus rubor* occurs in Ovid (*Amor.* 3.3.5) and Apuleius (*Met.* 2.8.4), but overlooked the significant use of *perfundi*.[23] For, *rubore perfundi* is, unlike *rubore suffundi*, a rare combination and the deliberate choice of *perfundi* over the more common *suffundi* illustrates the significance of this instance of nonverbal behaviour.[24] This combination, then, is first attested in Valerius Maximus' description of the incestuous passion felt by the Seleucid Antiochus for his stepmother Stratonice. The young man's blush at the entrance of his stepmother gives away his secret passion and the cause of his malady (5.7 ext. 1

[23] Klebs (1899) 236.
[24] On the poetics of the Roman blush see Rizzo (1991); Barton (1999).

ut eum [sc. *Antiochum*] *ad introitum Stratonices rubore perfundi* "when Stratonice came in he blushed all over" transl. D.R. Shackleton Bailey, Loeb). Scholars commonly regard this notorious story as the main source of inspiration for the opening of the romance of Apollonius, while the Seleucid Antiochus is taken as the primary model for the creation of the character of the incestuous Antiochus. Yet, it is usually overlooked that, unlike the situation depicted in our romance, Antiochus' incestuous passion is never fulfilled in a violent way. After Valerius Maximus, the phrase *rubore perfundi* occurs twice in Petronius (128.2; 132.12), with reference to the impotent Encolpius' blush of embarrassment in front of the wealthy matron Circe, and, later on, during his address to his penis. Donald Lateiner remarks on the latter blush: "The satirical romance has inverted the novelistic role of a blush, a virginal public admission, into a sodomite's private soliloquy, or colloquy with a drooping penis."[25] In *Apollonius of Tyre* the use of *rubore perfundi* seems to undergo a similar inversion, for while it has previously been associated with male embarrassment and unfulfilled sexual desire, here it refers to female passivity and violently fulfilled male sexual desire.

The phrase *roseo rubore perfundi*, which intensifies the dramatic tension of the scene, is elsewhere found in two Late Latin works, namely the *Liber ad Gregoriam* and the Latin *Gesta* of St. Agnes (*BHL* 156), both of disputed authorship and date. The *Liber ad Gregoriam*, once attributed to John Chrysostom, is now thought to be the work of the younger Arnobe, but, according to Kate Cooper, it may actually be dated to any time between the early fifth and the late sixth century.[26] This text—a manual for noble ladies—contains an encomium of the female virtue of endurance (*patientia*) in the troubles of everyday life; the phrase *roseo rubore perfundi* is found in the introductory section, with reference to trials undergone by the virtuous and the chaste: *Liber ad Greg.* 4 p. 389,18-20 Morin *hinc est quod inpudicorum turbae uelut incestos arguunt castos, et roseo genas pudicitiae rubore perfusas malae conscientiae fuco commaculant.*

The Latin *Gesta* of Saint Agnes, on the other hand, traditionally attributed to Ambrose, may also be dated as late as the end of the sixth century, according to Franchi de'Cavalieri. At the end of the

[25] Lateiner (1998) 178.
[26] For the issues of authorship, date and content of the *Liber ad Gregoriam* see Cooper (1996) 108-11; on the virtue of *patientia* in this text see Monat (1993).

nineteenth century its originality as a Latin text was a matter of strong debate, as the Passion of the celebrated Roman Saint was also transmitted in two Greek versions.[27] The romance of Apollonius is often cited for its thematic (and occasionally verbal) similarities with the Passion of Saint Agnes, but these are usually traced in the latter part of *Apollonius,* namely in the episode of Tarsia at the brothel, as, in later tradition, Saint Agnes was condemned to prostitution.[28] The *Gesta* present us with a striking image of a heavily eroticized death scene, which contains the expression *roseo rubore perfundi*. The young Agnes proclaims herself a Christian and faces charges of magic and imminent death by fire. As the flames leave Agnes unharmed, the vicar Aspasius, in fear of a public riot, orders that a sword be thrust through her throat. The virgin dies simultaneously a bride to Christ and a martyr: Ps. Ambr. *epist.* 1.14 Jubaru *Atque hoc exitu, roseo sui sanguinis rubore perfusam Christus sibi sponsam et martyrem dedicauit*.

In the three Latin texts mentioned above, *roseus rubor*, traditionally associated with *pudor virgineus,* is vividly imprinted on female bodies that are abused, raped or executed. The virginal rose figures as an erotic symbol of chastity or life that is either threatened or violently lost, and as a reflection of the bloodstained body of female heroines and Christian martyrs.[29] Antiochus' daughter (notably in rec. A)[30] and Saint Agnes are exemplary figures of sacrificed virgins, but the princess, unlike the Saint, is presented as a martyr without fatal bloodshed.

---

[27] For the controversy on the date and the originality of the *Gesta* of St. Agnes see Franchi de' Cavalieri (1899) and (1908) 141-64, reacting to Jubaru (1907). A concise survey is found in Denomy (1938) 24-32. An earlier date of this Passion is possible, according to S. Döpp in *RAC* XVIII (1998) 1324. For the typology, function and problems of dating of the *Gesta martyrum* see Delehaye (1936) 7-41; Cooper (1999) 305-8; Pilsworth (2000).

[28] See S. Panayotakis (2002) 109-10 with references.

[29] For the figural association of the red rose with the blood of martyrs see Joret (1892) 237-45; Poque (1971) 160-6; Den Boeft, Bremmer (1981) 53 and (1982) 397-9; Krauß (1994) 158-9. For sexual metaphors in martyr accounts see also Chew in this volume.

[30] The detail of the blushing face of the raped princess is significantly absent in the corresponding passage in recension B. There it occurs in a different passage and in an entirely different context, as it refers to Apollonius' blush of embarrassement as soon as he realises that the daughter of the king Archistrates is in love with him: *ut sensit se amari, erubuit ... videns rex faciem eius roseo rubore perfusam intellexit dictum* (B 21: 58.15-18). Compare the blush of male embarrassement in Valerius Maximus and Petronius mentioned above.

In this article I argued that three passages from the anonymous romance of Apollonius share the rhetoric of violence with well known death scenes from Biblical and hagiographical texts, namely the death scenes of Saint Stephen, Saint Polycarp and Saint Agnes. There are strong verbal and thematic links between the accounts of the last moments of the latter holy people and those of a treacherous couple, a greedy pimp, and a sexually abused child. There is, in my view, a relation of direct borrowing among *Apollonius of Tyre* and Late Latin historiographical and hagiographical traditions, but its direction and extent cannot be specified with any certainty, as many of the texts involved—not only *Apollonius*—present inextricable problems of dating and transmission; an overview of the material is necessary before reaching any—however tentative—conclusions. Of course, there are significant differences too. Death scenes in Biblical and martyrological texts involve a whole cluster of dynamic elements (prayer, miracles) that underline the personality of the martyr and the *imitatio Christi* achieved through the martyrdom.[31] These elements are absent from *Apollonius*. Yet, this discussion attempted to demonstrate that *Apollonius* is both aware of a continuous Latin literary tradition and exploiting Christian and non-Christian texts. The Latin *Apollonius of Tyre* is a polyphonic narrative, which cannot be fully appreciated in terms of rigid classifications or traditional dichotomies.[32]

---

[31] See Van Uytfanghe (1993) 147-9.

[32] Earlier versions of this article were delivered, apart from ICAN 2000, at two Latin Seminars held at the Universities of Amsterdam and Leiden. I wish to thank the audience of those meetings, and Costas Panayotakis, William Robins, Antonio Stramaglia, Rudi van der Paardt and Jan Bremmer for useful comments.

This page intentionally left blank

PART TWO

THE ANCIENT NOVEL IN FOCUS

SWORDPLAY-WORDPLAY: PHRASEOLOGY OF FICTION IN APULEIUS' *METAMORPHOSES*

Wytse Keulen

This paper focuses on one particular example of metafictional imagery from Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*.[1] This imagery draws on long-established views of the art of verbal persuasion as being contrived to deceive, to exaggerate and to insult, but also designed to move, to entertain, and to instruct. Behind the use of such imagery is the keen interest of an author who writes in response to the literary discourse of his age, which is marked both by the thriving of rhetoric and the genre of prose fiction, and by a lively engagement in literary criticism and rhetorical theory. The Apuleian imagery in question both embodies and comments upon traditionally questionable aspects of oratory and literature, and such imagery may therefore be read as symbolic of the literary activity in which the novel's author and his reader engage.

We find a pivotal example of such imagery at the outset of the novel in the anecdote of a sword-swallower told by the novel's protagonist and main narrator Lucius in the context of his programmatic discussion with a sceptical travelling companion about the credibility of a tale of witchcraft. To judge Lucius' own reliability as a narrator, it is important to note that he starts his narrative with a blatant lie. In the opening sentence after the prologue, he cannot refrain from stressing his kinship with the philosophers Plutarch and Sextus, whose origins he falsely attributes to the destination of his journey (1.2.1).[2] These fictional credentials provide us with a significant frame of reference for our understanding and judging of Lucius' characterisation. As we will see, Lucius likes to present himself as a philosopher, and his performance will strikingly resemble satirical portrayals of pseudo-philosophers, as we know them from Lucian.

---

[1] The title of this essay originates from a Dutch collection of poems: A. Roland Holst, S. Vestdijk, *Swordplay, wordplay: kwatrijnen overweer*, 's Graveland 1950 (I thank Ruurd Nauta for the reference).

[2] This is an example of 'kinship diplomacy'; on this phenomenon in antiquity see Jones (1999).

This goes both for Lucius' attitude in the debate, and for his ensuing anecdotes with which he intends to illustrate his rebuttal of the sceptic's incredulity. On the other hand, if we take a closer look at the cultural baggage that our traveller displays in these programmatic passages, we will find that it is of a genuinely Plutarchan pedigree, containing conventional views on language and literature that reveal great learning. These apparently conflicting aspects of Lucius' appearance in the first scenes of Apuleius' novel are important to the argument of this paper. On the one hand, the author of the text appears to offer a satirical representation of his principal narrator as a would-be philosopher. On the other, the text reveals a rich potential of meanings implied by a sophisticated phraseology of fiction, which points to a conscious literary strategy of the author outside the narrative, conducted in complicity with his *alter ego*, the *scholasticus* Lucius.

Let us take a look at the famous programmatic discussion, which starts after Lucius has dismounted from his horse, and overhears the sceptical reaction of one travelling companion to the wondrous tale narrated by another (1.2.5). Confuting the sceptic's incredulity, Lucius strikes a rather pedantic tone. He phrases belief in things that seem inconceivable in terms of an intellectual pursuit for which not everyone is proficient enough (1.3.2-3). Lucius' pedantic reaction to the incredulous companion equates scepticism with ignorance, and credulity with knowledge. With phrases like "a crass ear" (*crassis auribus*) and "you do not quite comprehend" (*minus hercule calles*), Lucius suggests that his opponent is simply not clever enough to appreciate a story about the supernatural. In exactly the same way, in Lucian's *Lover of Lies* (8; cf. also 3; *Halcyon* 3), the so-called philosophers convict the sceptic Tychiades of stupidity because he refuses to believe their fantastic anecdotes.

Lucius' emphasis on his opponent's insensitivity and even stupidity particularly calls to mind a passage from Plutarch's treatise on *How Young Men Should Study Poetry*, where he states that "the deceitfulness of poetry does not affect the really stupid and foolish," citing two authorities, the poet Simonides and the sophist Gorgias. According to Gorgias' theory, labelled 'doctrine of deception' by Verdenius, "the deceived is wiser, because it takes a measure of sen-

sibility to be accessible to the pleasures of literature…”[3] Paying homage to Gorgias’ doctrine of deception, Lucius implies that truth in a literary account depends on the reader’s sensibility to experience fiction as real. Thus, Lucius gets round the question of *mendacium* or *uerum* by shifting the focus onto the impact of a verbal account on the senses, as appears from his words “if you examine them a little more meticulously, you will ... feel...” (1.3.3 *quae si paulo accuratius exploraris, ... senties*).

Lucius’ emphasis on sense perception may be related to Gorgias’ notion of the physicality of speech. This notion forms part of Gorgias’ theory of speech as an autonomously created reality designed to ‘deceive’ the recipient. For this theory Gorgias is probably indebted to the theory of the physicality of sense perception of his alleged master, the legendary poet, philosopher and wonder-working healer Empedocles.[4] Our would-be philosopher Lucius seems to acknowledge this background by a sophisticated reference to a famous Empedoclean trikolon on the limitations of ordinary men’s perception (frg. 2 D-K):

> in this way these things can neither be seen by men or heard, or grasped in their mind.[5]

Lucius almost literally translates the line of Empedocles with the trikolon “novel to the ear or unfamiliar to the eye or at any rate too arduous to be within our mental grasp” (1.3.3).[6] This reference goes beyond a mere sophistic demonstration of erudition, as it seems to reflect the context of the Empedoclean quotation as well (cf. also frg. 3 D-K). Both Empedocles and Lucius contrast erratic beliefs of ordi-

---

[3] Plut. *bellone an pace* 5 (*Mor*. 348c) ὁ δ’ ἀπατηθεὶς σοφώτερος· εὐάλωτον γὰρ ὑφ’ ἡδονῆς λόγων τὸ μὴ ἀναίσθητον (translation by Russell, Winterbottom [1972] 6). The same view is presented in *De aud. poet.* 2 (*Mor*. 15c) οὐ γὰρ ἅπτεται τὸ ἀπατηλὸν αὐτῆς ἀβελτέρων κομιδ≈ καὶ ἀνοήτων. Plutarch’s reflections on literature reveal a great interest in the issue of ethical education and the spiritual process of the aesthetic experience; see Van der Stockt (1992) 166-70. On Gorgias’ views on verbal persuasion see Verdenius (1981); Porter (1994).

[4] For the Empedoclean nature of Gorgias’ conceptions of word-magic see Buchheim (1989) XVIII with n. 35.

[5] οὕτως οὔτ’ ἐπιδερκτὰ τάδ’ ἀνδράσιν οὔτ’ ἐπακουστά οὔτε νόῳ περιληπτά (translation by Barnes [1979] 235). The whole fragment is transmitted in Sext. *adv. math.* 7.122. I follow the interpretation of fragments 2 and 3 D-K by Barnes (1979) 234-6, who demonstrates that the fragment quoted above has been misunderstood as being sceptical already in antiquity. Cf. e.g. Cic. *ac.* 1.44 and 2.14 (see Haltenhoff [1998] 92, 99 f.); see further Wright (1995) 156 ad loc.

[6] *audita noua uel uisu rudia uel certe supra captum cogitationis ardua*.

nary people (cf. *opinionibus*; *uideantur*) to a kind of initiatory promise of true perception in a singular address (cf. *senties*). Moreover, Lucius' words in 1.3.3 reflect Empedocles' emphasis on the reliability of sense perception, if accurately used, to attain genuine understanding.

It is perhaps not a coincidence that the Empedoclean statement is also cited by Plutarch in *How Young Men Should Study Poetry* 2 (*Mor.* 17), where he teaches his students the importance of realising that poetry is not concerned with truth but with falsehoods, constructed to please or astonish the reader. Lucius' 'doctrine of deception,' then, does not just allude to Empedocles, but rather seems to reflect the Plutarchan use of the Empedoclean trikolon, bringing it into a discussion of the emotive working of literature. Lucius appears to share a vivid interest in this intriguing figure with his so-called ancestor (cf. 1.2.1), who not only quotes him very frequently, but is also alleged to have written ten books on him.[7]

Even more important is the affinity of the author of our novel, Apuleius, with Empedocles. I would like to argue that in the present passage Apuleius explicitly shows this affinity, as he does in his other works as well. Although Empedocles was celebrated as a poet, his claims to be a healer with magical powers were deemed outrageous already in his own time by the adherents of sceptical rationalism. Moreover, throughout antiquity Empedocles remained the target of sceptical criticism and even mockery, especially in the writings of Apuleius' contemporary Lucian.[8] It seems significant, then, that Apuleius, who in the *Florida* mentions Empedocles as an exemplary poet (*flor.* 20.5), in his *Apology* (27.1-4) even expresses his allegiance to him as a distinguished authority who suffered from a reputation of being a magician. Thus, in the present passage we may detect the voice of the author outside the narrative, who pays homage to an admired predecessor through a sophisticated reference made by his *alter ego* Lucius. However, if we are allowed to read such an authorial literary creed behind Lucius' statements, then again the question rises why the author makes such a caricature of his *alter*

---

[7] For Plutarch's admiration of Empedocles see Teodorsson (1989) on Plut. *quaest. conv.* 1.2.5 (*Mor.* 618b) τοῦτο μὲν ἐν κόγχαισι ... ναιετάουσαν.

[8] For Pliny's explicit criticism of Empedocles' magical practices cf. Plin. *nat.* 30.9. Cf. Lucian. *dial. mort.* 6 (20).4; *fugit.* 2; *Icaromen.* 13; *ver. hist.* 2.21; see Waszink (1947) on Tert. *anim.* 32.1 with further references.

ego, characterising him like one of the self-indulgent charlatans derided by Lucian, of which Empedocles is a famous example.

This satirical characterisation equally emerges from the ensuing chapter in which Lucius tells two anecdotes in order to illustrate his adherence to the doctrine of deception.[9] Elsewhere I have treated his first anecdote of nearly suffocating by gobbling up cheese *polenta* as an illustration of his 'poetics of the *gaster*,' in which his gluttony stands for his gullibility.[10] The present inquiry will focus on the second anecdote (1.4.2 f.):

> And yet in Athens, a bit before that, in front of the Stoa Poikile, I saw with these two eyes a circus performer swallow a sharp edged cavalry sword with a lethal point. Then, I saw the same man insert—at the invitation of a small fee—a hunting lance all the way down to the depths of his bowels, starting with the part that holds out the menace of death.[11]

Rather than employing arguments and reason in order to convince his opponent, Lucius tells anecdotes from his own personal experience, a typical habit of pseudo-philosophers such as Lucian criticises in the *Lover of Lies* (9).[12] Faithful to his own philosophy, Lucius prefers to amaze his audience by straining after effect. For Lucius, seeing is believing: *Beglaubigung* replaces evidence. Moreover, by placing Lucius in a crowd amazed by a miraculous spectacle at the Stoic colonnade, Apuleius hints at the negative reputation of the Stoa of being uncritical and credulous concerning providence and supernatural phenomena like divination (cf. e.g. Cic. *div.* 2.86), and thus indirectly characterises Lucius as an extremely credulous and superstitious philosopher.[13]

At the same time, both the performance of the *circulator* and the attributes he uses contain significant imagery that provide a multi-

---

[9] For an overview of the various interpretations of this difficult passage see Hofmann (1997) 155 ff., esp. 157 with n. 50.

[10] Keulen (2000) 317 f.

[11] *et tamen Athenis proxime et ante Poecilen porticum isto gemino obtutu circulatorem aspexi equestrem spatham praeacutam mucrone infesto deuorasse ac mox eundem inuitamento exiguae stipis uenatoriam lanceam, qua parte minatur exitium, in ima uiscera condidisse* (translations from the *Met.* are my own unless stated otherwise).

[12] Cf. also Cic. *div.* 2.27 (Cicero rebukes his brother Quintus).

[13] Lucius' superstitious belief in fate (1.20.3) recalls Stoic views on predestination, and anticipates his surrender to Isis in the shape of *Prouidentia* at the end of the novel. In 2.12.1, Lucius propagates Stoic ideas on divination (see *GCA* [2001] 207 on *nec mirum ... enuntiare*).

levelled illustration of Lucius' 'doctrine of deception'. Making part of the enthusiastic crowd carried along by the show, Lucius presents himself in the role of eager audience, a role that we will see curiously reflected in the action performed and the equipment used by the sword-swallower himself. In Plutarch, again, there is a very close parallel for the Apuleian image of sword-swallowing, containing both the element of the performing juggler and an explicit connection with the effect of speech. In a context where the proverbial terse speech of the Spartans is compared to their equally proverbial short swords, Plutarch reasons that just as their swords are easily swallowed and apt to reach the enemy, so their terse speech reaches its goal and captures the listener's attention (Plut. *Lycurg.* 19.2).[14] Behind this image we may observe a rich Greek tradition of poetic imagery representing the tongue or a keen thought or argument in terms of sharp, pointed weapons or incisive instruments, a metaphorical tradition still vital in the literary discourse of Apuleius' time.[15] Apuleius exploits the rich potential of this imagery for the programmatic significance of this and other passages. The sharpness of the sword represents the incisiveness of the word.[16] The swallowing of the sword and the lance illustrates the penetrating effect of speech upon the senses of the recipient. In a similar way, in the tale of *Cupid & Psyche*, the *narratrix* uses the image of the sword when she describes how the sisters start persuading Psyche to kill her husband (5.19.5):

> (they) unsheathed the swords of their deception, and assaulted the timorous thoughts of the guileless girl.[17]

---

[14] Cf. Plut. *prov. Spart.* (*Mor.* 216c); the same proverb is found in *Mor.* 191e; see Manfredini, Piccirilli (1980) 266 f. on Plut. *Lycurg.* 19.2. See also the Gnom. Vat. 394-5.

[15] See the appendix on words as weapons in Lieberg (1982) 174-8. For the imagery in Greek poetry see Nünlist (1998) 153 f. (Pindar); for examples from tragedy see Griffith (1983) on Aesch. *Prom.* 311 τραχεῖς καὶ τεθηγμένους λόγους (with lit.); Stanford (1963) on Soph. *Ai.* 584 γλῶσσα τεθηγμένη. Contemporary to Apuleius and later: cf. Galen. *de captionibus* 2 (see Edlow [1977] 92 ff.); on Christian authors see Almqvist (1946) 128, with further lit.; Lardet (1993) 32.

[16] *Praeacutus* and *mucro* in 1.4.2 recall Latin rhetorical terms that refer to keenness and shrewdness applied to speech and ideas, and to the 'cutting edge' of a speech; cf. Cic. *Caecin.* 84; Quint. *inst.* 9.4.30; Lact. *inst.* 3.5.8.

[17] *destrictis gladiis fraudium simplicis puellae pauentes cogitationes inuadunt* (tr. Hanson [1989]). See *GCA* (2003) ad loc. Cf. also 5.12.4 *iam mucrone destricto iugulum tuum nefariae tuae sorores petunt*.

These connotations may also explain the enigmatic phrase used by Aristomenes to describe the sense of overwhelming anxiety caused by believing Socrates' narrative. When Socrates tells him a list of magic feats performed by the witch Meroe (1.9-10), including miraculous transformations into animals, Aristomenes appears to be shocked by them and remains overcome by feelings of horror until the end of his story (1.11.1 f.):

> "You relate astonishing tales," I say, "And equally harrowing, my dear Socrates. Indeed, you have also struck me with no slight worry, or rather fright, as you have hit me with no small pebble of concern but with a spear-thrust of dread, that with the same assistance from divine powers as she used before that old woman will learn of those talks of ours."[18]

The original metaphor of the "spear-thrust of dread" represents the psychological effect of Socrates' stories on Aristomenes.[19] He has anxiously swallowed the miraculous accounts to such an extent that he sees them as truth. The magic power of Socrates' words has not only convinced him of the existence of Meroe's supernatural powers, but also penetrated him with feelings of a strong anxiety that he himself could become a victim of these powers. In light of Lucius' doctrine of deception, we can say that Socrates has been a very competent storyteller, and Aristomenes an ideal audience.

The performance of the sword-swallower is thus a visualisation of Lucius' plea to succumb to the penetrating power of the word. And there is still more to be said. For his function as a visualisation of a programmatic statement on fiction, two traditional aspects of the juggler are especially significant, that of vulgar entertainment and that of deception.[20] Our *circulator* seems the incarnation of metaphorical expressions for ostentatious rhetoric covering an incredible

---

[18] *'Mira', inquam, 'nec minus saeua, mi Socrates, memoras. denique mihi quoque non paruam incussisti sollicitudinem, immo uero formidinem, iniecto non scrupulo, sed* <u>*lancea*</u>*, ne quo numinis ministerio similiter usa sermones istos nostros anus illa cognoscat.'*

[19] *Lancea iniecta* recalls the expression *pilum inicere* that Plautus uses for causing worry and trouble; cf. Plaut. *Most.* 570 *pilum iniecisti mihi*; on the metaphorical sense see Brotherton (1926) 69.

[20] The word *circulator* is more or less synonym to *praestigiator* ('trickster,' 'juggler'; cf. *flor.* 18.4 with Hunink [2001] 183 f. ad loc.). On *circulatores* see Scobie (1969) 28 f.; Scobie (1983) 11 with n. 61; Salles (1981) 7 ff. (*circulator* = *fabulator*); C. Panayotakis (1995) 79 n. 66 (with further references); Dickie (2001) 224-43 ('Itinerant magicians').

content, which had a strongly polemic function in the literary discourse more or less contemporary with this novel.[21]

The sword-swallower's performance, then, appears emblematic of both the incredible and belief in the incredible, embodying both an assertion of the power of the word and a succumbing to it. These two extremes correspond to the double role of Lucius, both author of incredible stories and eager audience. This double role invites a programmatic interpretation of the sword-swallowing imagery, regarding both the producing and the 'swallowing' of fiction. Thus, the description of the sword-swallower appears as a visual comment on the genre of prose fiction, a low kind of literature contrived to entertain a gullible audience. At the outset of his work of fiction, we may observe in this description a reflection of the author upon the relation between himself and the reader. Through the text we see a sophist treating his audience to an astonishing performance of rhetorical prestidigitation, representing the stylistic and rhetorical tastes of his time. The author uses his narrator as an accomplice for the heralding of his own literary program.[22] Curiously enough, both narrator and the literary program voiced by him are presented in clearly *negative* terms. As a result, we as readers of this novel may also be invited to perceive our own role in an equally negative light; we are in a sense being confronted with the fact that we also are swallowers of fiction. This paradoxical self-referentiality of the novel, offering a curiously blown-up picture of its own poetics and pragmatics, becomes even more manifest in the climax of the anecdote.

Lucius' allusions to traditional notions of the magical and therapeutic power of speech culminate in a miraculous therapeutic vision of the snake twisted around the staff of Asclepius (1.4.4-5):

> And look! Behind the lance's steel, where the shaft of the reversed weapon near the back of his head protruded from his throat, a boy arises, graceful to the point of effeminacy. With sinuous twists he unfolds a limp and loose dance, to the amazement of all of us there. You might have said that onto the healing god's staff—the gnarled one he

---

[21] Juggler imagery: cf. LSJ s.v. θαυματοποιέω II; cf. Quint. *inst.* 2.4.15; 10.1.8. Cf. Gell. 10.12.6; Tert. *apol.* 23.1; Min. Fel. 26.10; Aug. *c. Faust.* 29.2 p.745, 11 (see *ThLL* s.v. *praestrigiae*, 937, 26 ff.; 938, 20 ff.).

[22] For Apuleius' use of the 'virtuoso style,' designed to please the ear, in the tradition of Gorgias, see Tatum (1979) 140 f. (on the *Met.*) and Pernot (1993) 382 f. (on the *flor.* and *apol.*).

> wields with half-pruned twigs—the magnificent snake was clinging with wriggling embraces.[23]

Lucius reveals to us both the constructed nature of the show and the deeper significance we could perceive in it. On the one hand, he again proves to be the typical charlatan, who conjures up a prophecy from an illusionary trick, just like Lucian's Alexander of Abonuteichos the false prophet deceived the people in the market places with fake epiphanies of the god Asclepius (*Alexander* 13 ff.; 26). On the other hand, this vision conceals a genuine religious commitment of the author behind the narrator, which is closely connected to his literary activities. The author crowns his view of his own literary artistry with the icon of Asclepius, the Second Sophistic's patron saint of Eloquence, whose priesthood he has probably held and for whom he has composed various literary works, both poetry and prose.[24] We may add now another example to the various genres of literature through which Apuleius honoured his highly esteemed god of Eloquence, namely prose fiction, which incorporates and parodies the traditional literary genres, and is designed to entertain a sophisticated audience. The programmatic epiphany of Asclepius, symbolising the triumph of the power of the word, foreshadows the epiphany of Isis at the end of the novel,[25] the multiform goddess who makes Lucius regain his voice and becomes the "Muse for this novel" (Finkelpearl [1998] 208 f.). Thus, the authorial literary testimony implied in the

---

[23] *et ecce pone lanceae ferrum, qua baccillum inuersi teli ad occipitium per ingluuiem subit, puer in mollitiem decorus insurgit inque flexibus tortuosis eneruam et exossam saltationem explicat cum omnium, qui aderamus, admiratione. diceres dei medici baculo, quod ramulis semiamputatis nodosum gerit, serpentem generosum lubricis amplexibus inhaerere.*

[24] Apuleius has composed various literary works in honour of Asclepius (cf. *flor.* 18.38 *prorsa et uorsa facundia ueneratus sum*; see Hunink [2001] 193), e.g. a long speech (cf. *apol.* 55.10 *de Aesculapii maiestate*); moreover, he dedicated a bilingual hymn to the deified hero, and a bilingual dialogue, of which *flor.* 18 is the extant introductory speech. Cf. also *Socr.* 15 p. 154 *alius alibi gentium, Aesculapius ubique.* For the popularity of Asclepius during the Second Sophistic cf. Philostr. *Vit. Soph.* 535, 568, 611; *vit. Apoll.* 1.8-9; 4.11; on his popularity in Carthage see Harrison (2000) 6, 123. Being the son of Apollo, "leader of the Muses and lord of all culture" (Lucian. *hist. conscr.* 16), he is also protector of the art of literature: "Lorsque les patients sont des sophistes, Asclépios devient *ipso facto* protecteur de l'éloquence" (Pernot [1993] 626, with lit.); cf. esp. Ael. Arist. *Or.* 50.47 and 50.50-2.

[25] See Hofmann (1997) 158 f., who connects the 'therapeutic vision' to the salutary appearance of Isis in Book 11, and especially (161) to the vision of the snakes of Isis (11.3.5).

programmatic description of the juggler can be viewed as a *Metamorphoses* in miniature, or ‘the novel in a nutshell’.

If the interests of author and narrator run parallel to such a great extent—among other things, their affinity with Plutarch, their admiration for Empedocles, and their devotion to Asclepius—why does the author represent his *alter ego* as an unreliable charlatan, a gullible *scholasticus* who gets carried along by the cheap show of a juggler and conjures up epiphanies himself? Perhaps these conflicting tendencies can be reconciled if we connect them to the conscious literary strategy of the ‘hidden author,’ the literary game he plays with his reader (see also J. Morgan and T. Whitmarsh in this volume). Apparently, the author seems to make the reader his sceptical accomplice in observing Lucius as a ridiculous pseudo-philosopher, an unreliable narrator appearing on the stage of low literature. However, the author turns out to be the accomplice not of the reader, but of the narrator, whom he makes the mouthpiece of his deceptive literary strategy. Through a clever phraseology of fiction, in the vein of Plutarchan reflections on literature, he alerts the reader that (s)he is about to imbibe draughts from a notorious source of corruption, the recognition of which may transform it into a long-established source of instruction. What appears pernicious will turn out to be pleasurable and profitable for those who are proficient enough to take it for what it is. If we suspend our disbelief willingly, we will see, hear, grasp, and be healed. Being initiated into Apuleius’ creed of credulity, we will enjoy swallowing his sharp swords of deception and lances of anxiety.

NYMPHS, NEIGHBOURS AND NARRATORS: A NARRATOLOGICAL APPROACH TO LONGUS

John Morgan

Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe* is a devious and elusive text. A not uncommon experience of readers is to be left with a sense of uncertainty as to exactly how seriously one is supposed to take it, a feeling in some quarters that it makes claims on which it does not deliver, and in others that it reaches for a profundity belying its superficial simplicity. This paper will suggest that Longus' apparent ambiguity can best be read as the product of his particularly subtle narrative technique.[1]

My interest began with the effects produced by a polyphony of narrating voices, particularly in cases where there is a separation of 'authorial' and 'narratorial' voices, where the story is told not directly by the author but by a narrator whose fictional status and character determine both how he tells the story and how the reader is cued to actualise it. Before exploring how this idea can be applied to *Daphnis and Chloe*, let me circle around it a little and set it in context.

An obvious example of such a separation of voices occurs in Lucian's *True Histories*, where there is a definable moment of transition from one to the other. The preface, in a voice that we may as well call the author's, forcefully makes the point that nothing in the ensuing narrative is true. It is hard to imagine a more radical distancing from the voice that narrates the body of the text, a first-person account of a fantastic voyage using all the standard tropes of authorisation and authentication. The point of course is precisely to subject the narrator's use of those tropes to authorial irony, ostensibly as a criticism of historians and other writers who have told as true what they know to be untrue. However, both voices are 'I' and both are equally 'Loukianos';[2] the ambiguity of their relationship al-

[1] The ideas advanced in this paper derive from my commentary on *Daphnis and Chloe* (Morgan [2003]), where they will be found more fully exemplified. All translated quotations from *Daphnis and Chloe* in this paper are from the translation accompanying the commentary.

[2] The narrator casually reveals his name at *VH* 2.28.

lows the narrative to develop its own impetus, and to be read as a story in its own right as much as a satirical descant on the work of others.

The separation of author from narrator is an obvious feature of novels narrated in the first person, whose narrator is, by definition, a fictional character operating in a fictional world created by the author. In novels of this sort, the author's communication with the reader is of necessity devious and indirect: the author's voice is silent, and the narrator is, in varying degrees, denied the 'authorial' qualities of omniscience and definitive judgement. First-person narrators can occupy almost any point on a spectrum from complete reliability (the author's mouthpiece) to complete unreliability; wherever they stand their narrative becomes readable only when the reader can get a 'fix' on them and so see what distortions, if any, they are imposing on their material. The independence of narrator from author forms the basis of Gian Biagio Conte's reading of the *Satyrica*:

> Behind the protagonist's narrative we meet the hidden author, who is also listening, along with the reader, to Encolpius' narrative – and along with the reader is smiling at it. Behind the naïve narrator who in speaking of 'I' exposes himself and his desires, an agreement is being reached between the author and the reader of the text…The two voices are kept forcefully apart, if only because Encolpius is kept far from…every value that a sensible author could reasonably expect to be shared by his readers. The result of this distancing is precisely an "unacceptable" narrative.[3]

This interpretive strategy is close to one that I tried myself to apply to Achilleus Tatios' *Leukippe and Kleitophon*, the only surviving Greek novel with a first-person narrator.

> Suspended between a first-person narrator of dubious reliability and a mischievously subversive implied [or in Conte's terminology, hidden] author… Kleitophon's voiced perceptions often do not coincide with those of a careful reader.[4]

My argument was that Achilleus so arranges his material that behind Kleitophon we can find hints of a truer story, the author's story, that the narrator is incapable of telling about himself: "throughout the

[3] Conte (1996) 21-2.
[4] Morgan (1996b) 179-80.

novel he is depicted as a man who tries to read and write his life as if it were the plot of a novel."[5]

Most narratology does not see the distinction between a first-person and a third-person narrator as a particularly crucial one. A first-person narrative can be just as omniscient as a third-person one, and a third-person narrative can be just as partial as a first-person one. But there is possibly some historical progression, in that the effects of distanced narrators seem to have first developed in imitation of the first-person narrative of the *Odyssey*. Thus the earliest and simplest novels tend to rely on a straightforward omniscient third-person narrator. Chariton for instance grammatically forecloses any possible gap between author and narrator by beginning his text with a sentence framed by the words "I Chariton … shall narrate" (Χαρίτων … διηγήσομαι, 1.1.1). This is not to say that the narrator of *Kallirhoe* is not characterised: he is projected as a contemporary of the events he relates (with significant present tenses at 5.2.2, 5.4.5, 6.8.7, and possibly 4.6.1), and intervenes with editorial *sententiae*, Homeric quotation, and direct address to the reader. But the separation of narrator from author is not part of the economy of Chariton's novel: the adoption of this particular narratorial persona is designed to naturalise rather than problematise the fictional discourse, and there is no impulse to take the narrator's statement as anything other than the whole fictional truth. At the other chronological extreme of the genre's history, Heliodoros had developed a far more sophisticated mode. His third-person narrator is not omniscient, just a more articulate and better-placed version of the reader. He narrates only what could have been seen or heard by someone actually present at the events he describes, and has, for example, no privileged access to emotion or motive. In this case it becomes legitimate to ask who the narrator is and not to expect the answer that he is an inscription of the author: the author presumably knows the totality of his own story. Nonetheless it is difficult to say much more about Heliodoros' primary narrator other than that his knowledge and point of view are partial. Cognoscenti of the scholarly bibliography on Heliodoros will be well aware of the continuing critical interest in his secondary narrator, Kalasiris, whose performance is clearly moulded by his sophistic and devious personality.[6] This is not the place to enter into

[5] Morgan (1996b) 185.
[6] Winkler (1982); Futre Pinheiro (1991); Baumbach (1997).

more detailed discussion. My point is simply that within the corpus of the ancient novels there was clearly an awareness of and developing interest in the effects that could be achieved through the use of characterised narrators of various sorts, even though, no doubt, their writers and readers would have made no sense of the terms in which we discuss such things today.

Daphnis and Chloe is unique among the extant novels in having a third-person narrator who is himself a clearly located fictional character but not an actor in the story he relates, a bit like Mr Lockwood in *Wuthering Heights*. His is the voice that speaks in the prologue to the novel and tells the story of his discovery of a painting while hunting on Lesbos.

Longus' prologue has some formal similarities to that of Achilleus Tatios. In both the primary narrator speaks in the first person, but whereas Achilleus' prologue provides a *mise en scène* for a first-person narration by a different voice (Kleitophon's), in *Daphnis and Chloe* the same voice continues as the third-person narrator of the body of the novel. Like much else in Longus' novel the prologue functions at several distinct levels simultaneously. At one it forms a bridge between the real and the fictional worlds: it serves to set its story in real geographical space and provide it with a plausible provenance and hence with authentication. In this respect it has in fact succeeded very well historically; there is a minor scholarly tradition of trying to relate the story of Daphnis and Chloe to the precise geographical realities of Lesbos.[7] But at another level the prologue is already part of the fiction, not just, as it were, physically inside the cover of the book, but inside the frame of the novel as well, inside the fictional world created by Longus. The discovery of the painting is a fiction, and so is the grove in which it is fictionally located: a geographically and historically plausible fiction but a fiction nonetheless. It follows that the person who discovered the fictitious painting is himself a fiction: it is convenient but not wholly accurate to call him 'Longus'. A second, no less important, function of the prologue is thus to give us a triangulation on this narrating voice and

[7] Scarcella (1968); Kondis (1972); Mason (1979); Green (1982); Bowie (1985); Mason (1995). I am convinced by the arguments put forward by Mason in his forthcoming book to show that certain details of Longus' landscape show a first-hand acquaintance with Lesbos. The result, however, is still far from a photographic representation of specific Lesbian localities.

help us to locate him in relation to the silent (or hidden) author, from whom he is distanced in a number of ways. It is within this distance that the irony that I take to be a central feature of the novel can operate.[8]

Four salient and defining features of the narrator are established in the prologue. They also define the 'narrator's narratee', the fictional reader whom the fictional narrator is addressing. It is useful to distinguish this hypothetical person from the equally hypothetical 'author's narratee', the reader who can read through the narrator and with whom the hidden author is in communication, as they represent the two levels on which any real reader can legitimately engage with the text.[9]

1) The narrator is on a hunting holiday in rural Lesbos, where he is seeing the local sights for the first time. He is thus defined as urban, and aligned with urban characters within the novel such as the young Methymnaians and the significantly named Astylos (*asty* = town), who also come to the countryside to hunt. These townspeople within the novel approach the countryside with pre-formed attitudes. It is a place where they come for a holiday from their life in the city. Like them the narrator has a palpably urban perspective on the country and its inhabitants. His use of the countryside as a place to pursue pleasure marks him, both realistically and by analogy with characters in the novel, as not just urban but a member of the wealthy elite.

2) The prologue is full of words of shallow approbation: the discovery is "very nice" (κάλλιστον); the grove too is "nice" (καλόν). In so far as these words are applied to the natural or agricultural phenomena of the countryside, they denote an urban aestheticism: rural populations tend to have a much more utilitarian approach to their

---

[8] The deliberate destabilisation and fragmentation of narrative authority is a characteristic of Hellenistic poetry, and Longus' poetics (as well as his primary intertexts, Theokritos and Philitas) are solidly Hellenistic.

[9] Narratological terminology is notoriously variable. My distinction between 'author's narratee' (or 'author's reader') and 'narrator's narratee' corresponds to that drawn by the Groningen Apuleius commentaries (following the terminology of Lintvelt) between 'abstract reader' and 'fictive reader'; see *GCA* (1995) 7-12, *GCA* (2000) 27-32. Similarly, the figure to whom I refer in this paper simply as 'the narrator' corresponds to their 'fictive narrator', and my 'author' to their 'abstract author'.

environment, in reality and in the novel.[10] The aesthetics extend to the work of art, which is ultimately deemed "more delightful" (τερπνοτέρα) than the beauties of nature. This is the beginning of the novel's dialectic between nature (φύσις) and art (τέχνη) and there is an obvious sense in which these two poles correspond to country and town. In other words, the prologue inscribes an urban aesthetic that privileges the superficial beauty of the countryside and the pleasures to be enjoyed there above any concern with the realities of a subsistence rural economy, and will ultimately subordinate even those beauties and pleasures to those associated with the city. It is already important to make the point that the author has left himself the space to adopt a critical perspective on the limitations of the narrator's values.

3) The narrator gazes at the painting without understanding it. His description re-enacts his perplexity: he sees a series of scenes whose connections and unity are not immediately apparent:

> It showed women giving birth and others dressing the babies in swaddling-clothes, babes abandoned and beasts of the flock feeding them, shepherds taking them up and young people making pledges, a pirate raid and an enemy invasion, and much else, all of it amorous. (*pr.* 2)

It is not even clear that the same figures are involved from one scene to the next. The very fact that the picture is a narrative with a temporal dimension seems to elude the narrator, as evidenced by the fact that the order in which the various panels of the painting are described does not correspond exactly to the order of the equivalent episodes of the novel.[11] Somehow he construes all the scenes as "amorous" (ἐρωτικά; "sexy" perhaps), although those which he lists, with the single exception of the "young people making pledges" are not obviously connected with love. Formally the amorous content may be largely contained in the unspecified "much else," but one might also suspect that the narrator is projecting his own concerns and priorities on to an as yet unexplained image: the painting's very beauty seems to entail a presumption that its subject matter is erotic, and the narrator responds to it erotically ("I looked and I wondered,

[10] For example, the courtyard of the master's villa has been used as a dung-heap, which needs to be cleared before he visits (4.1.3); and his ornamental park is obviously neglected in his absence (4.4.1).

[11] The "young people making pledges" refers to the scene at 2.39, which is preceded by both the pirates and the enemies (i.e. the Methymnaians).

and a desire [πόθος] seized me…” *pr.* 3). Unable to piece together the sense for himself, he seeks out an exegete, his only source of information. So the story that we begin to read after the prologue is essentially the narrator’s retelling of that of the exegete, who was himself expounding someone else’s creation. The story, as an invention, is thus twice distanced from the voice narrating it. This is, of course, a conventional mechanism of authentication, but it also emphasises, even before the story begins, that the story (fictionally) has an existence separate from this particular telling of it, that the narrating voice is not that of the controlling creative intelligence but rather that of a failed reader driven by desire. The narrator’s response to the picture is paradigmatic of his intended reader’s response to the text, which is the painting’s verbal equivalent; perhaps an additional hint that the narrator’s take on the story is in principle no more definitive than the reader’s own. At this level then the narrator’s text claims the illusionist *enargeia* and emotional force of the visual arts. At the same time the intervention of the exegete (a common motif in the exposition of allegories)[12] hints, over the narrator’s head, that just as the painting did not reveal its meanings at a first glance, so the novel that transcribes it may also be in need of exegesis. The convention both indicates the limitations of the narrator and encourages the author’s reader to look for deeper, possibly allegorical meanings.

4) The narrator dedicates his text to Eros; he intends it as a “possession to delight all mankind” (*pr.* 3) that will bring comfort and healing to the lovesick. A plethora of literary topoi already implies that the narrator shares the conventional conception of love as a sickness in need of cure. As the novel proceeds, however, it will become clear that the centre of Daphnis and Chloe’s erotic education is precisely a movement from that view of love to an acceptance of it as something far more positive and profound; the narrator’s erotics are thus distanced from those of the author as much as his aesthetics. The prologue ends with a prayer for *sophrosyne* (self-control or chastity): “For ourselves, may the god grant us to remain chaste in writing the story of others” (*pr.* 4). The first-person plural pronoun in this sentence (ἡμῖν) seems to include the reader along with the narrator, who elsewhere speaks of himself in the singular. The possibility of losing artistic distance and control and ending up with mere por-

[12] As in Kebes’ *Pinax*, or Lucian’s *Herakles.*

nography is a particularly acute problem for this narrator: partly because he is himself captivated by a beautiful visual object and in his story visual beauty is the stimulus of Eros; partly because the discovery in the book that the remedy for love is sex risks identifying his own remedial text with the sexual act. However, the very fact that a narrative immediately commences suggests that he believes that his prayer has been heard, and that he has successfully produced a text that will resist pornographic misreading. Equally, the mere fact that he felt the prayer necessary draws attention to the possibility of the 'wrong' sort of reading, and almost challenges the reader included in that ἡμῖν to find the suggestive subtexts that the narrator is suppressing.

In general terms, the effect of Longus' narrative strategy, as it grows from the prologue, is that *Daphnis and Chloe* is told by its narrator as if it were a simpler and more conventional story than it really is, and invites its reader to read it in the same way. One way to describe this textual duplicity is to think in terms of a surface 'narrator's text' and a deeper 'author's text'. We can conceive the narrator, as established by the prologue, as a distorting and simplifying lens between the story and us. As readers we effectively have the choice of accepting what we see through the lens (that is reading the 'narrator's text' as the 'narrator's narratee') or of correcting for it and reading around the narrator (that is reading the 'author's text' as the 'author's narratee'). In applying this scheme to the text itself, I want to highlight four aspects of the narrator that illustrate or are explained by the idea that he is distanced from the 'hidden author' (though I do not intend this as an exhaustive taxonomy of Longus' narrative repertoire):

1) Just as the more sophisticated narrator and his reader view the naïve protagonists with ironic humour, so there are places where the narrator himself is subjected to a more covert form of ironic humour.

2) The narrator sometimes evinces a less than complete understanding of the story (factually as well as ethically), though the author unobtrusively supplies the material on which a different and fuller understanding may be reached.

3) One element of the narrator's urban persona is a propensity to idealise the countryside, through sentimental fantasies of 'noble simplicity' and 'pastoral innocence', and also through the imposition of the *sophrosyne* he prays for in the prologue. The story itself resists

the notion of the country as a repository of moral values lost by the city, and the text abounds with ribald *double-entendres* which can hardly be accidental: in this latter respect readers have at all periods succeeded in reading the text in a way different from that explicitly proposed by its own (fictive) narrator.[13]

4) Conversely the urban perspective also entails disdain, manifested as either amused superiority or downright hostility, of the earthiness and lack of sophistication of the real countryside and its inhabitants. In this perspective country-folk are seen as boorish peasants (ἄγροικοι) rather than bucolic shepherds or cowherds. Daphnis and Chloe's rusticity, for example, is belied by their beauty, which is "too fine for the countryside" (κρεῖττον ἀγροικίας, 1.7.1); Lykainion is "too glamorous for the countryside" (ἀγροικίας ἁβρότερον, 3.15.1); these judgements by the narrator correspond exactly to those of the urban characters within the novel (4.20.2, 4.32.2). Again the story itself resists easy judgments of this nature.

The poles of the tension embodied by 3) and 4), incidentally, are perfectly figured by the changing responses of the young Methymnaians in the novel. To begin with they come to the countryside for a vacation: they want to play at enjoying the simple life for a while and to act out the urban fantasy of pastoral simplicity without confronting the realities of subsistence agriculture. In order not to spoil their vacation with petty haggling or arguments, they are happy to pay over the odds for food, and content themselves with a few complaints when their mooring-rope is stolen to replace a broken one needed in the vintage (2.12.4, 2.13.2). It is only when their ship and everything on board is lost, a loss too serious to ignore, that they become angry, resort to violence and start to treat the country people as their inferiors. Their experience measures the distance between wilful pastoral fantasy and a rural reality where the equipment is rotten and no one will buy what he can steal instead. The story itself exposes their fantasy as the unreality it is, and their hostility as a conditioned social reflex. As clear parallels have been established between the Methymnaians and the narrator himself, the same tendencies can be seen to be at work in the way the novel itself is narrated. In this way the

[13] On this see Goldhill (1995) 1-45.

hidden author comments on his narrator and indeed the whole enterprise of pastoral literature.[14]

I turn now to some specific illustrations of the above. In Bk. 1 Daphnis has been abducted by pirates but is rescued when some trained cows respond to a tune on the panpipes and leap overboard, capsizing the pirates' ship and sending them to a watery grave. The already ludicrous sequence (obviously the author's parody of the use of pirates and shipwreck as plot-staples in the romance genre) is expanded by an enthusiastically pedantic explanation of the mechanics of the sinking of the ship. The narrator rounds things off with a little paradoxographical excursus, clearly to be read as his own elaboration of the basic data (1.30.6): your cow is an excellent swimmer (he tells us), much better than your human being, in fact second only to ducks and fish. Cows, however, are handicapped by the fact that their feet drop off when wet. The absurdity of this has dismayed scholars. Castiglioni proposed the excision of the whole section:[15] *utinam recte***,** comments Michael Reeve in the apparatus of his Teubner edition, *sed Longum sapit* ("I wish rightly; but it smells of Longus"). No other ancient writer shares the belief that cows lose their feet in moist conditions: I myself live in the dampest area of the United Kingdom, where cows pass their entire lives standing in puddles, but I have never seen one hoof-less. The excursus is humorous, but in a complex way: the humour is the author's; the joke is on the narrator, who purveys this surreal nonsense in all seriousness. Other narratorial intrusions (such as those on Lesbian wine at 2.14 and 4.10.3) lack the irony of this one, but still position him as an eager purveyor of erudite detail from a strictly urban viewpoint. It is perhaps worth remarking that Achilleus' narrator Kleitophon is also ironically characterised by a propensity towards absurd paradoxography.

In a general way, *Daphnis and Chloe*'s awareness of its own artificiality and its ironic play with the literary conventions by which it is configured belong at the level of the author and are at the expense of the narrator. This aspect of the text starts as early as the prologue. There, as we have seen, the narrator responds to the *enargeia* and emotive power of a visual artefact and hints that it is inherited by the literary text into which he has transmuted the painting. He has, in

---

[14] See further Effe (1982); Saïd (1987); Pandiri (1985).
[15] Castiglioni (1906) 312.

other words, a realistic agenda. Despite his intentions, however, the very fact that the novel is presented as inspired by Art distances it from reality, highlights its artificiality, and reminds us that even its *enargeia* is a literary construct. If for Plato the visual arts were already at two removes from reality (*Rep.* 10.598b), *Daphnis and Chloe* is an imitation of an imitation of an imitation; and if for Plato the earthly beauty that arouses love is but an image of real, ideal beauty (*Phaidr.* 249d ff.), its narrator is aroused by an image of an image. The narrator does not recognise this distance from reality, but the author does; and so he is able to manipulate and satirise the self-concealing conventions of formal realism which romance usually employs unreflectively. A good example of this effect occurs towards the end of Bk. 1, after Daphnis' "completely unexpected escapes from the double dangers of piracy and shipwreck" (1.31.1, romantic staples already subjected to critical humour at the authorial level, as noted above). Unexpectedness is valued by fiction; it makes the story exciting, and here the narrator espouses those generic values and even trumps them by doubling the dangers; but he is undermined by authorial irony, since the rescue of the hero is anything but unexpected to practised readers of romance; the extravagant unexpectedness of Daphnis' rescue draws attention to the artificiality of the conventions.

Next an example of the narrator's imperfect grasp of the story: it concerns the painting of the prologue, which he describes as an εἰκόνος γραφή ("a depiction of an image," *pr.* 1). At the very end of the novel Daphnis and Chloe dedicate εἰκόνες ("images," 4.39.2) in the grove of the Nymphs. Many readers have associated the two images:[16] this way *Daphnis and Chloe* can be read as the first self-generating novel, authorising itself from within as a transcript of an autobiographical document by its own protagonists. The striking point for our present purposes, however, is that the narrator's surface so conspicuously fails to connect the two images. One effect of making the identification is that the grove of the prologue, where the narrator discovered the painting, becomes (or so we realise at the closure) none other than the shrine of the Nymphs, one of the story's central and most numinous locations; again the narrator shows no sign of recognising this. In a way this heightens the reality effect: the narrator's failure to see everything that is there implies that there

[16] Wouters (1989-90); Hunter (1983) 42-3; Imbert (1980).

really is something there to be seen. But another inescapable corollary is that the narrator is characterised as a less penetrating and complete reader of his own story than the ‘author’s reader’.

The first of the ‘neighbours’ referred to in my title is Dorkon the cowherd. In Bk. 1 Daphnis falls into a wolf-trap, from which he is extricated by Chloe, with Dorkon’s help. The trap draws attention to itself by its total disregard for verisimilitude: it is a pit one *orguia* across and four *orguiai* deep, that is about 7 metres, the height of a two-storey house, and is one of a number dug by the country-folk in a single night (1.11.2). Vieillefond calculated that a pit of these dimensions would produce about 26 metric tonnes of spoil,[17] which is apparently disposed of without trace. It might also occur to us to wonder what is the depth of topsoil on a Greek island, and whether it would be possible to excavate so deep a hole without using dynamite to blast the rock away. In order to rescue Daphnis, Chloe removes her breast-band and lowers it into the pit, so that he can climb up it. If she needs a breast-band seven metres long, Chloe is obviously already a well-developed young lady for her thirteen years. And when we next meet Dorkon we are told that from that day he had been “amorously inclined” (1.15.1, ἐρωτικῶς ... διετέθη, a phrase borrowed from Plato’s *Symposium* 207b, where it is applied to the sexual instincts of animals) towards Chloe. The narrator says no more, either from obtuseness or from the *sophrosyne* for which he prayed in the prologue, but the author’s reader can easily infer that Dorkon’s glimpse of Chloe’s innocently bared breasts was instrumental in his infatuation. Even his name tips the wink to the author’s reader behind the narrator’s back: besides its ironic pastoral connotations (δόρκων = “deer,” but this one is a deer in wolf’s clothing!), Δόρκων is cognate with δέρκομαι (“I see clearly,” an etymology known and exploited in antiquity).[18] In a genre where the onset of love is canonically linked with the sense of sight, we have here a classic example of the male gaze. Dorkon, who is sexually aware (he knows the “name and deeds of love,” 1.15.1), can ‘see’ Chloe more clearly than the still innocent Daphnis. Here, at a very simple level, the story gives a careful reader material from which he can reach a rounder,

---

[17] Vieillefond (1987) clxxxiv-v.

[18] Most neatly in St Basil’s *Homil.in Prov.*6.4 (*PG* 31.1500c): “the deer (δορκάς) is a sharp-sighted (ὀξυδερκέω) creature, named for its sharp sight (ὀξυδορκία).”

deeper and more explicit understanding than the narrator is inclined to allow.

The second neighbour is Lykainion, a person of some structural importance, and the second of the novel's pivotal educators. The narrator typecasts her as a highly sexed kept woman who lusts after Daphnis and seduces him in the woods. But if we read beneath the narrator's surface we can discover another story that the narrator does not write, a skeletal subplot that forms an instructive counterpoint to the main story, and one driven by complex and shifting motivations. Lykainion is a glamorous town-girl, who has been brought to the country by Chromis. The strange word applied to her, γύναιον ("little lady," 3.15.1), is intended to be disparaging and indicates that she is not Chromis' wife; she may even be a slave. He did not bring her here to feed his hens, nor (if she had any choice in the matter) did she follow him from the city because she felt a vocation to bake bread. We surmise that their relationship has been a rampantly physical one, but Chromis is "now past his best physically" (παρηβῶν ἤδη τὸ σῶμα, 3.15.1), not old exactly but not as indefatigable in bed as he once was. Without the sexual chemistry, Lykainion is trapped in a lonely and loveless life in an environment where she does not belong, from which predatory and illicit liaisons are her only escape; through her we are offered a momentary glimpse of an appalling alternative to both the romantic fantasy surrounding Daphnis and Chloe and the companionable, if coarse, domesticity of their foster-parents. But if Lykainion begins as a desperate predator, her selfish desire is transformed into altruism. At first she wants to "possess" Daphnis (3.15.3, κτήσασθαι, a word implying some degree of permanence), but after seeing Daphnis weeping for his failure to make love to Chloe, she feels sympathy for them (3.15.5, συναλγήσασα) and conceives the double aim of saving the young lovers as well as satisfying her own desire. She is an instrument of the Nymphs and Eros, though she is unaware of their agency. She has already lied to Chromis to give herself an excuse for going out, and lies again to Daphnis in order to separate him from Chloe. But when she reassures Daphnis by telling him that she knows of his love for Chloe because she has had a dream of the Nymphs in which they instructed her to save him by teaching him the deeds of love, and goes on to say that she will teach him to please the Nymphs (χαριζομένη ταῖς Νύμφαις, 3.17.3), her lies hint at a truth too deep

for her to have perceived. The notorious moment of intercourse with Daphnis is presented in purely educational terms; there is no suggestion that Lykainion derives any pleasure from it, and although she had once hoped to keep Daphnis as a lover, she does not now envisage any repeat performance. However, she still fundamentally misreads her pupil, assuming that he will go away to have sex with Chloe and giving him practical advice about the pain and mess of defloration. Every one of her predictions turns out to be wrong. In fact, in acquiring knowledge of sexual technique, Daphnis also acquires new responsibilities towards Chloe, which bring him closer to emotional as well as physical adulthood. Knowledge gives him an existential freedom not to use it immediately or unreflectively. In exercising this freedom out of love for Chloe, Daphnis discovers what it is that differentiates humanity from the animals he has hitherto tried to imitate. So Chloe retains her virginity until her wedding night, when she loses it joyfully, with none of the blood and shouting which Lykainion foretold. However, Lykainion's unwritten story has a happy ending. Not only is she present at the rustic wedding at the end of the novel but she is also accompanied by Chromis (4.38.2). This is a moment of synthesis and reconciliation, of reintegration of the pastoral society. We are left to surmise that since her encounter with Daphnis, Lykainion's own failing relationship has somehow been renewed, that her tuition of Daphnis was also a moment of healing in her own fractured life, a moment of transfigured intentions prompted and rewarded by the powers that guide the story. All this eludes the narrator, even to the point where he can smile in knowingly sarcastic fashion at Daphnis' reaction to Lykainion's offer of tuition "as if he was about to be taught something important, something truly heaven-sent" (ὥσπερ τι μέγα καὶ θεόπεμπτον ἀληθῶς μέλλων διδάσκεσθαι, 3.18.2). But even as the narrator smiles, we are reminded by the echo of Platonic doctrine[19] that Love truly is heavenly, both in this story and at large, and that what Daphnis is about to learn is the human aspect of the entire benevolent dispensation of Eros as outlined by Philetas.

Another story unwritten by the narrator but implicit in the author's text concerns the Nymphs who oversee the love of Daphnis and Chloe. We are told on one occasion, almost incidentally, that they are

[19] As at *Phaidros* 245b, for example.

three in number (2.23.1),[20] and there is a number of signs that they are to be identified as the named heroines of the three inset myths: Pitys, Syrinx and Echo, whose names leap out of the text at us at crucial junctures.[21] For example Daphnis is rescued from the pirates ἤχῳ σύριγγος ("by the sound of the pipes," 1.29.2). Philetas, the protagonists' forerunner in love, tells of his own experience of love:

> I would call on Pan to aid me, for he had been in love himself with Pitys. I would bless Echo for repeating Amaryllis' name after me. I would smash my pipes (κατέκλων τὰς σύριγγας) because they charmed my cows but did not bring me Amaryllis (2.7.6).

Again the names of the three heroines are prominent, that of Syrinx hidden in the reference to the panpipes she became. Chloe's rescue from the Methymnaians includes manifestations of all three: she is revealed sitting crowned with pine (ἐκαθέζετο ... τῆς πίτυος ἐστεφανωμένη, 2.28.2), the sound of pipes is heard (σύριγγος ἦχος ἀκούεται, 2.28.3) as she disembarks from the Methymnaian ship, and again to lead her and the flocks home (ἡγεῖτο σύριγγος ἦχος ἥδιστος, 2.29.3). In Bk. 3 (21-3) Daphnis and Chloe hear an echo from behind a headland, which prompts Daphnis to tell Chloe the story of Echo: by obvious etymological wordplay ἦχος in the frame leads to ἠχώ in the myth. The headland is, as it were, Echo's home, and when a few chapters later the Nymphs appear to Daphnis in a dream and guide him to a purse washed ashore from the Methymnaian ship wrecked on that same headland, the author's reader is left to see, quite independently of the narrator, the agency of Echo and the other Nymphs in guiding the plot providentially, extending backwards through the text to the point where the Methymnaian ship was first lost. Of course, once the identification of the Nymphs has been made the stories of Pitys, Syrinx and Echo acquire new significances within the structure of the novel, taking the author's narratee down the road to profoundly religious and cyclical readings of human love.[22] The narrator himself seems oblivious of a whole layer of the story he is telling.

---

[20] The number appears only in V, the better of the two primary manuscripts.

[21] Pitys, of course, is not the primary heroine of the first of the myths, which concerns the transformation of an unnamed girl into the wood-dove. The distancing of the story of Pitys, who like Syrinx and Echo is a victim of Pan's sexuality, reflects the innocence of Daphnis and Chloe at the time when the myth is related.

[22] See Morgan (1994a) 69-70, 77.

The incident with the cicada and the swallow at 1.26 sticks in the minds of many readers. The narrator's surface is one of innocent charm, reflecting the naivety of the protagonists, though many readers acknowledge an ironic and voyeuristic response. They feel, in other words, impelled to read more than the text actually tells them. The way I want to explain that experience is to suggest that the narrator's imposition of idealising pastoral charm and prim *sophrosyne* has foreclosed, at the surface level, the erotically charged connotations of the episode which nonetheless continue to exist and function at the level of the hidden author. The incident follows Daphnis piping at midday (1.25.1). Given the prevalent Theocritean intertextuality, to which Daphnis' very name repeatedly draws attention, we are intended to recall the first poem of the Theocritean corpus, where the goatherd warns against playing the *syrinx* at midday because it disturbs Pan from his siesta (Theokr. 1.15). The alert reader is thus preprogrammed to see the agency of Pan in the ensuing episode, when a swallow chases a cicada into Chloe's bosom, giving Daphnis the opportunity to put his hand down her dress to extract it. The bird and the insect cohere precisely with the symbol-system of the novel as a whole, representing respectively the predatory and the musical (i.e. harmonious) aspects of nature. The pursuit of the cicada by the swallow is thus exactly analogous to that of the Nymphs by Pan, the template of all three inset myths, and like them forms a link in the chain of the author's articulation of large truths about human sexuality and its relation to the natural scheme. But as so often those deep truths are concealed under a patina of easy charm.

In this instance, we can also see clearly the linkage with the narrator's prayer for *sophrosyne* in the prologue, resulting in his (fictitiously) wilful imposition of a prim ethical perspective on a story which resists its own narrator's telling of itself. This again is a recurrent effect: when, for instance, Daphnis and Chloe play rough and tumble with their animals, the narrator sees only innocent exuberance at their release from the chores of the vintage; but the word συμπαλαίω ("wrestle with," 2.2.6), common as a metaphor for sexual intercourse (and so used at 3.19.2), hints that their increasingly physical games are not at all as innocent as the narrator would have us believe.

A different kind of hidden subtext may be traced through the episode of the marriage negotiations at the end of Bk. 3.[23] The reader can piece together an elaborate interplay of realistic character in the hard-nosed poker-game played out between the protagonists' foster-families, each of which knows that it has a blue-chip financial investment. The coherence and the wry humour suggest that this interplay is intentionally there, but yet again it is to be found by reading against the narrator's grain. Like the urban characters in the story, who insist on a sanitised, 'Disneyland' version of the country, where the grapes are carefully polished, the drains are cleaned and the lawns mown, the narrator and his narratee evade the complexities and realities of true subsistence agriculture, accommodating country life instead to the patronising categories of the sentimental or the burlesque. Between the narrator's lines, as it were, a more realistic and more sympathetic picture of peasant life can be discovered. More subtly read, Longus' countryside acquires a solidity, a dignity, and a moral depth that challenge these facile urban perspectives.

If I am right in suggesting that the narrator gives only a partial and sometimes simplistic view of the story, we are left with theoretical problems of how to identify the 'author's text', and to what extent, if any, it is to be privileged over the narrator's.

Apart from those few cases where the narrator intervenes directly in a way that makes it difficult to take him seriously (as with the swimming cows), there are two obvious ways in which the 'hidden author's' presence makes itself felt. First, by the apparently casual inclusion of details which the narrator fails to emphasise but which cumulatively enable a different take on the story (as in the episodes of Dorkon and Lykainion discussed above); second, and more important for a reading of the novel as a whole, through elaborate structural symmetries and symbolisms sign-posting important connections and meanings that are not made explicit by the narrator (as with the Nymphs and the swallow and cicada).

The second question is more complicated and brings us up against the limits of this way of reading *Daphnis and Chloe*. There is clearly a sense in which the two voices, narrator and author, must be in a hierarchy. In the case of Petronius, for instance, no one would really

[23] This episode is fully discussed in my commentary (n.1 above).

want to argue that Encolpius' version of the world is to be given equal weight with that implied by the structure and economy of the novel as a whole: the subordination of narrator to author is a vital element in the text's signification. So too in *Daphnis and Chloe,* the apparently sophisticated simplicity of the textual surface conceals big issues, which the peculiar complexity of Longus' technique highlights by ostensibly minimising them. It is for example a recurrent trope that the narrator's irony is turned back on himself, that in assuming himself more sophisticated than his characters he reveals himself as less profound than his story and its best reader. I have already discussed one example of this, in the Lykainion scene. Here are two more. When Daphnis and Chloe are first sent out to the flocks, they assume their duties happily, "as if it were a great office" (ὡς ἀρχὴν μεγάλην, 1.8.3). From his urban perspective the narrator is sarcastic about the pettiness of rural life. But in this novel shepherding is revealed (in the words of Eros at 2.5.4, and of Philetas at 2.7.2, which the narrator simply reports, with no sign that he has registered their importance) as the analogue of Love's providential care for humankind, and thus it really is "a great office." And as Chloe falls in love with Daphnis and admires his beauty as he sits piping beneath their oak-tree, she believes that "music was the cause of his beauty" (1.13.4, αἰτίαν ἐνόμιζε τὴν μουσικὴν τοῦ κάλλους). For the narrator this is an index of her childishness, but again she turns out to be speaking a deep truth, since within the symbolism of the novel, music comes to represent the creative and benevolent aspects of Nature and Eros, which are indeed the cause of beauty.[24]

However, I want to resist too systematic a disentangling of narrator and author in terms of surface and structure, because it seems to me that despite the dichotomy I have been discussing the narrator is still 'Longus' in a sense in which Encolpius can never be Petronius. The separation is a useful way of describing some of Longus' innovatory narrative effects, and a possible way of understanding how it is that *Daphnis and Chloe* can be simultaneously trivial and profound, camp and serious, self-deconstructing yet still profoundly signifying. But in so far as the irony is directed at the very assumptions that underlie the writing of pastoral literature, Longus is ultimately directing it at himself; unlike

[24] On music in the novel, see Chalk (1960); Maritz (1991).

the author and the text, the narrator has no objective existence. Before it can be read ironically, the novel must be read at its face value; and it is an historical fact that many readers have felt no compulsion or direction to go further. What is more, Longus, the real human being with a second-century pen in his hand, was not a narratologist. There are thus equally places in the text where the irony is palpable but refuses to come into focus in narratological terms. One example must suffice. At 1.12.5, after Daphnis emerges from the wolf-trap, the goat he was chasing is also pulled out, with both its horns broken. “So that was how it was punished for what it had done to the goat that lost the fight” (τοσοῦτον ἄρα ἡ δίκη μετῆλθε τοῦ νικηθέντος τράγου). The evocation of providential justice in such a context is surely ironic, but we lose our time if we try to decide whether the irony is that of the urban narrator using the incongruity to raise a superior smile at the expense of his rustic subject matter, or of the hidden author mocking a sentimental world-view seriously held by the narrator.

Precisely because the unstable antiphony of narrator and author is not taken to the logical extreme unavoidable with a first-person narrator, the novel leaves us perpetually uncertain as to whether we are reading it correctly, whether we are missing something vital or reading more than is really there. That is what makes *Daphnis and Chloe* such a difficult text, one that requires us to work hard at reading it, just as its author/narrator says in the prologue that he worked hard to produce it. Its very elusiveness, the co-existence and coalescence of its voices, its avoidance of overt answers and pre-digested interpretation, are all elements in its didactic power, though ultimately its didactic thrust is both more problematic and more profound than that adumbrated by its narrator’s prologue.

READING FOR PLEASURE: NARRATIVE, IRONY, AND EROTICS IN ACHILLES TATIUS

Tim Whitmarsh

Leucippe & Clitophon is exceptional among the corpus of extant Greek novels in that it is almost entirely narrated by a central protagonist in the narrative.[1] The opening words are those of an unnamed figure explaining how he met Clitophon lamenting his experiences in love; and in response to his request, Clitophon narrated his tale. That tale then becomes the remainder of the novel (there is no return to the outer frame at the conclusion). This feature—so-called 'ego-narration' (or, to use a technical phrase, 'character-bound narration'[2])—has often been remarked upon from a narratological perspective: commentators have shown how subtly Achilles manipulates his readers' knowledge and ignorance of events for the purposes of narrative tension and drama.[3] In this essay I want to take a rather different approach. What *sort of* narrator is Clitophon? How does his identity affect his selection and interpretation of material? And what pleasures are to be had from observing his partisanship and blindspots? In other words, does Clitophon's narrative dramatise a *certain kind of* approach to novel-reading, an approach that is itself explored, distanced, problematised, ironised?

Ego-narratives are not in and of themselves ironical, they become so when they are read as such; when, that is, a gap (be it cognitive, moral or intellectual) opens up between the focalization of the narrator and that of the reader. But for a narrative to be read as ironical (rather than, say, simply contemptible), the reader must recognise a complicity with a figure (not necessarily a character, but an identifiable perspective) within the text who shares her perspective.[4] The

---

[1] If we restrict the corpus to the canonical five, that is. *Lucius, or the ass* and Lucian's *True stories* are first-person narratives, as was Antonius Diogenes' *Marvels beyond Thule* (see Hägg [1971] 319; Stephens, Winkler [1995] 116-18).

[2] Bal (1997) 22.

[3] Hägg (1971), esp. 124-36; 318-22; Fusillo (1991) 97-108; Reardon (1994).

[4] "Whenever an author conveys to his reader an unspoken point, he creates a sense of collusion against all those, whether in the story or out of it, who do not get the point. Irony is always thus in part a device for excluding as well as including …

'real'—or, better, the exodiegetic—reader, then, must side with an 'implicit' reader, who is a construct of the text.[5] The latter figure can be confected in a number of ways. In Conte's trenchant and invigorating analysis of Petronius' *Satyricon*, for example, a distinction is drawn between the voice of the ego-narrator and the subtle prompts of the 'hidden author', mocking and tripping up the ego-narrator.[6] On this interpretation, Petronian irony is generated by the exodiegetic reader's (or, at least, *one* exodiegetic reader's, Conte's) perception of shared values with the 'implicit' reader, a figure who looks down upon the ego-narrator.

But 'irony' is notoriously slippery. How do we definitively locate tone, nuance, innuendo? And again, how can we be sure that we have exhausted the irony? That our esodiegetic allies are not playing us false, turning the joke against us? "I notice," writes Booth, "only those clues that I am prepared to notice, and I am therefore not usually aware of irony as something that gives *me* real trouble. We always like to think of the *other* reader as the one who is taken in."[7] Locating narrative irony is an exercise in self-projection, in casting oneself in the role of sophisticate at the expense of others (others in the text, or other exodiegetic readers: earlier Classical scholars, for example …).

I want to argue that the narrative ironies of *Leucippe and Clitophon* are subject to such indeterminacy: HOW you read, WHERE you locate irony, depends very much upon what kind of reader you want to make yourself into. That is to say, there is no one implicit reader, sneering at the ego-narrator, but a variety of possible positions. I do not mean simply that readers make meanings, that interpretations are subjective, that there are potentially infinite ways of approaching this text: this seems to me obviously true of this (as of any) text, but trivially so. What I want to argue is that Achilles specifically and artfully subverts the authority of the narrator by proposing contrary readings, and that these alternative perspectives are

---

In the irony with which we are concerned, the speaker [i.e. the narrator] is himself the butt of the ironic point" (Booth [1983] 304).

[5] " … the implied reader as a concept has his roots planted firmly in the structure of the text; he is a construct and in no way to be identified with any real reader … The concept of the implied reader is … a textual structure anticipating the presence of a recipient without necessarily defining him" (Iser [1978] 34).

[6] Conte (1994).

[7] Booth (1983) 305.

bound into the narrative's thematic exploration of identity, particularly of sexual identity.

If the *Satyricon* betrays (or can be read as betraying) traces of a subversive alternative voice, then such interpretative issues are redoubled in *Leucippe & Clitophon*. Not only is there the hidden author, Achilles (the primary narrator), but also the unnamed ego-narrator of the initial frame (the secondary narrator, whom the reader may or may not decide to identify with the author). It may well be that there are no explicit markers of intervention by either primary or secondary narrator, and (after the frame) the text can be read as Clitophon's narrative alone;[8] but then again, there are ambiguous cases where the focaliser could be *either* Clitophon *or* the unnamed narrator. This problem is particularly acute in the case of the numerous *sententiae* that spot the text: whose opinions are these?[9] As in the case of Plato's *Symposium* (echoed by Achilles in other contexts: see below), the 'chinese-box' structure generates a crisis of focalisation.[10] If the line of narrative transmission is not reemphasised in the course of the narrative by markers of narratorial attribution (we never meet the *Symposium*'s elaborate "he said that he said …"), this does not mean that it is 'forgotten'.[11] To borrow an analogy from electrical circuitry, the *Symposium*'s narrative transmission is serial, that of Achilles parallel: in the latter case, the coexistence of hidden authors is an everpresent but unexpressed potentiality, and stimulates (or can stimulate) the reader to explore narrative ironies.

Clitophon's ego-narration is further distanced if we acknowledge a disjunction between Clitophon the retrospective narrator (who

---

[8] Hägg (1971) 125.

[9] Hägg (1971) 107 argues that the *sententiae* function as "'timeless' pieces of commentary," implying that they are focalized at the level of narration rather than experience. But how can we tell for sure? In the course of a rich and fundamental discussion of the *sententiae,* Morales (2000) 79-80, observes a joke on restricted, experiential focalization at 5.5.2 ("It seems that with barbarians one wife will not satisfy Aphrodite's needs"): "as we find out in the episode at the end of Book 5, it is Clitophon who is the adulterer … On rereading the novel, or on reflecting back to 5.5.2, one finds that the *sententia* is a joke, an ironic jibe at Clitophon's hypocrisy." This *sententia* is, for sure, a special case, embedded as it is in direct speech addressed by Clitophon to Leucippe; but other, equally 'ironic' *sententiae* are ambiguously focalised. What right, for example, would the hyperemotive Clitophon have to pronounce on the volatility of Egyptians (4.14.9)? On ambiguous focalisation, see further Bal (1997) 159-60.

[10] Henderson (2000) 296-7, and esp. Halperin (1992b).

[11] Gaselee (1917) 455 n.1.

knows what has really happened, and what will happen next) and Clitophon the agent in the story (whose perspective is only ever partial); between, that is, the focalizing of narration (*Erzählung*) and that of experience (*Erlebnis*). As Hägg clearly shows, the overall presentation of narrative in terms of the restricted cognition of Clitophon the agent is overlain with numerous narratorial markers of Clitophon the narrator.[12] The latter, as we meet him in the frame, is a jaded, worldly-wise figure, whose experiences in love recommend him as a suitable instructor to the unnamed narrator (i.e. the secondary narrator). A number of Platonic echoes in the introductory chapters serve to confirm the Socratic authority of the speaker.[13] He claims to be in possession of sure knowledge about Eros ("I should know! Eros has dealt me enough blows!,"[14] ἐγὼ ταῦτα ἂν εἰδείην ... τοσαύτας ὕβρεις ἐξ ἔρωτος παθών, 1.2.1). His 'experience' exists both at a general, abstract level (he has learned through suffering, πάθει μαθών), and at a self-reflexive level: as one who has lived through the text's action, he possesses narrative insight that the reader (the first-time reader, at any rate) necessarily lacks. At a metaliterary level, he is 'novelised': he possesses a generalised familiarity with the structural expectations and generic set-pieces of novelistic narrative. Clitophon's 'novelisation' is signalled in the early stages of the text via a series of puns upon the concept of the *telos* (ritual 'initiation' into the cult of Eros, but also the 'end' of the narrative). Clitophon is, the unnamed narrator observes, "recently initiated into the god's cult (*teletês*)" (οὐκ μακρὰν τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ τελετῆς, 1.2.2). At one level, this telestic imagery only foreshadows the recurrent coupling of the language of mystery-religions with that of desire throughout the novel, another Platonic borrowing (this time from the *Symposium*).[15] But the word-play also implies a self-consciousness

---

[12] Hägg (1971) 124-36.

[13] Cf. esp. 1.2.2: σμῆνος ἀνεγείρεις .. λόγων· τὰ γὰρ ἐμὰ μύθοις ἔοικε ("That is a swarm of stories that you are stirring up … My tale is like a fictional adventure"). This evokes Plato, *Rep.* 450a for the "swarm of stories" (ἑσμὸν λόγων), and possibly *Gorgias* 523a for the μῦθος / λόγος contrast. The topographic description (1.2.3), plane-trees and all, obviously rehashes *Phaedrus* 227a-30e (Trapp [1990] 171), already a hackneyed repertory in Plutarch's time (Plut. *Amat.* 749a).

[14] Translations from Whitmarsh (2002).

[15] Pl. *Symp.* 210a; cf. 202e-203a, 215c. For mystic imagery in Achilles, see also 1.7.1, 1.9.7, 2.19.1, 5.15.6, 5.16.3, 5.25.6, 5.26.3, 5.26.10, 5.27.4, 8.12.4. Even Merkelbach cannot read the metaphor of desire as initiation as straightforwardly soteriological: "[w]as Kleitophon hier unter der "Weihe" des Eros versteht, ist nur der geschlechtliche Umgang, für den er die Metaphern der Mysterien verwendet"

about the intensified knowledge one acquires through the experience of reading through to the end of the text. Sexual consummation and intellectual discovery coexist on the same narrative axis. When we meet Clitophon at the start of the text, we are forcibly reminded that he speaks as one who has already reached the *telos* of the novel.[16]

At one level, then, Clitophon the narrator is knowing and artful. But the perspective he adopts throughout his account is primarily that of Clitophon *the agent*: ignorant, immature, desperately short on 'novelisation'. In particular, his naïveté is offset against the greater knowingness of his cousin, Clinias, "young but two years older than myself; he had been initiated (*tetelesmenos*) into the cult of Eros ..." (νέος δύο ἀναβεβηκὼς ἔτη τῆς ἡλικίας τῆς ἐμῆς, ἔρωτι τετελεσμένος, 1.7.1). Later, he addresses Clinias as one who has been "an initiate for longer than me, and you are already more familiar with the mysteries (*teletêi*) of Eros" (ἀρχαιότερος μύστης ἐμοῦ καὶ συνηθέστερος ἤδη τῇ τελετῇ τοῦ θεοῦ, 1.9.7). Clinias has already attained the *telos* of his own romance. It is to Clinias that he initially turns for an *erôtodidaskalos*, a "teacher of desire." The dynamic between Clinias' knowingness and Clitophon's ignorance—which plays an important part in the novel as a whole—is introduced here. Clitophon blurts out his sufferings, all hackneyed erotic symptoms (sleeplessness, imagining Leucippe constantly: 1.9.1-2),[17] concluding that "there has never been such a misfortune" (οὐ γέγονεν ἄλλο τοιοῦτον ἀτύχημα, 1.9.2 – the sense seems clear despite the textual uncertainty).[18] Clinias replies that this is nonsense (ληρεῖς, 1.9.2): in relative terms, he is very fortunate. The delight of this passage lies in the self-reflexive acknowledgement that despite the novelty of the experience for Clitophon, *every* love story incorporates sleeplessness and suffering, the staples of a hackneyed erotic symptomatology.

Clitophon is, thus, an ambiguous figure, at once knowing (*qua* narrating focaliser) and naïve (*qua* experiencing focaliser). Conven-

([1962] 116 n.6 on 1.7.1); see pp. 114-60 for a (literalist) account of mystery-religious language in the text.

[16] A comparable play in Heliodorus with the *peras* of the narrative and of the world (10.14.4: see Whitmarsh [1998] 98).

[17] For sleeplessness, see e.g. Long. *D&C* 1.13.6; 1.14.4; 2.9.2; 3.4.2; 4.29.4; 4.40.3; for envisaging, Ap. Rh. *Arg.* 3.453-8; Virg. *Aen.* 4.3-5; Char. *Ch.&C.* 2.4.3; 6.7.1.

[18] Reading ἄλλο with O'Sullivan (1978) 317 for ἄλλῳ.

tional narratological models can accommodate such ambiguities, distinguishing between different 'levels' of narration, so that the narrator is held to 'cite' the actor.[19] This process is particularly endemic in the novel, where narrative self-consciousness rules: "the text shifts its meaning in such a way that the reader must sense a fiction writer behind the character ... narrating."[20] But I want to argue, over the course of this essay, for a more radical indeterminacy: it is not that different parts of the text can be attributed to different 'levels' of Clitophonic narration, but that there is *always* an ambivalence about this narrator. We are never quite sure how much he knows.

We shall return to Clitophon presently, but let us for now turn to Clinias. This figure is strongly signalled by Achilles as a polar contrast to Clitophon, a literary and erotic sophisticate, a prodigious pederast well acquainted with the history of erotic narrative. His earlier misogynistic speech recaps Hesiod, Semonides, and Attic tragedy, marking the intertextual allusion to drama self-consciously ("all the lying fictions with which women have filled the stage," ὅσων ἐνέπλησαν μύθων γυναῖκες τὴν σκηνήν, 1.8.4). In a later speech, he connects *erôs* with learning and sophistication, as a "self-taught sophist" (αὐτοδίδακτος … σοφιστής, 1.10.1), a phrase borrowed from Plato and Xenophon (and echoed further on in the text).[21] The medium is (also) the message: the knowing intertextual allusion bolsters the speaker's claim to understand desire (in literary-historical as well as pragmatic terms).

Though he is not much older, Clinias plays (in the heterosexual narrative, at any rate) the instructive, elder figure, a standard role in the novelists (compare the piper Philetas in *Daphnis & Chloë*, the priest Calasiris in the *Aethiopica*). When Leucippe, Clitophon *et al.* decide to flee Tyre, they turn to Clinias (2.26 ff.). When after the shipwreck Clitophon meets up with Satyrus and Menelaus, his joy is tempered by grief at their ignorance as to the whereabouts of Clinias, "after Leucippe, master of my life" (τὸν μετὰ Λευκίππην ἐμὸν δεσπότην, 3.23.3) – the sorrow of Charicleia and Theagenes at the loss of Calasiris in the *Aethiopica* is directly comparable. Clinias is

---

[19] Bal (1997) 44.

[20] Winkler (1985) 153, on Apuleius.

[21] See also 5.27, αὐτουργὸς ... ὁ Ἔρως καὶ αὐτοσχέδιος σοφιστής ("Eros is a resourceful, improvising sophist"). The idea of Eros as a teacher comes in Euripides' first *Hippolytus* (fr. 430 N); he is then called a 'sophist' by Plato (*Symposium* 203d) and Xenophon (*Education of Cyrus* 6.1.14).

treated by Clitophon as a highly 'novelised' expert, a beacon guiding him through the uncertain vicissitudes of life.

Most important for the present purposes, though, is the contrast between Clitophon's and Clinias' differing degrees of aptitude in reading the trademark type-scenes of novelistic narrative. Clitophon is prone to repeated tragic lamentation, casting himself as a plaything of random fortune, and interpreting τύχη (which, as Ewen Bowie has observed, often self-reflexively alludes to the novelistic plot[22]) as malevolent chaos: for the novel's protagonist, life is a constant battle against the unexpected hostility of an inscrutable divine order. Fortune plays sick jokes on humanity: "let Fortune devise some new game" (παιζέτω πάλιν ἡ Τύχη, 4.9.7). Fortune is "grudging" (φθονερά, 1.13.6, with Vilborg & O'Sullivan; *contra* πονηρά, with Garnaud; *cf.* ἐφθόνησεν ἡ Τύχη, 5.7.9). Clitophon, experiencing life in a novel from the perspective of an inept, does not realise the most fundamental law of the genre: that the loving couple are always reunited at the end.

Clitophon's lack of perspicacity is particularly pronounced in the matter of the series of false deaths undergone by Leucippe. When she is disembowelled by Egyptian bandits, he sits there stunned "out of surprise" (ἐκ παραλόγου, 3.15.5). A παράλογον is literally something that runs contrary to (παρά) the discourse (λόγος); but *Scheintod,* as every reader knows, is one of the staple of novelistic discourse. Perhaps, on this initial occasion, Clitophon's *naïveté* is forgivable. But he is caught out again: when Leucippe is abducted by pirates in the pay of Charmides, they pretend to sacrifice her and throw her into the sea, in order to hold up the pursuers (5.7). This trick nevertheless fools Clitophon, even second-time around, who laments "This time, Leucippe, you have really died ..." (νῦν μοι, Λευκίππη, τέθνηκας ἀληθῶς, 5.7.8). On yet another occasion, a spurious prisoner relays a false story to him about Leucippe's death (7.3), and on this occasion ... well, he falls for it again. His hypertragic lament (7.5) is heavily ironic, because it contains a superficial recognition of the centrality of *Scheintod* to novelistic narrative, without—even now—any understanding of the central truth that the heroine never dies:[23]

---

[22] Bowie (1989) 128 (on Chariton). See also Nimis in this volume.
[23] See also Whitmarsh (2001) 80-1.

> Alas, Leucippe, how many times death has torn you from me! Have I ever ceased lamenting you? Am I always to mourn you, as death follows death? All those other deaths were just Fortune's jokes at my expense, but this one is no joke on Fortune's part.
>
> οἴμοι, Λευκίππη, ποσάκις μοι τέθνηκας· μὴ γὰρ θρηνῶν ἀνεπαυσάμην ... ἀεί σε πενθῶ, τῶν θανάτων διωκόντων ἀλλήλους ... ἀλλ' ἐκείνους μὲν πάντας ἡ Τύχη ἔπαιξε κατ' ἐμοῦ, οὗτος δὲ οὐκ ἔστι τῆς Τύχης ἔτι παιδιά. (7.5.2)

Clitophon's inclination is ever to see the situation in hyperdramatic terms. His language of lamentation is drawn from tragedy (οἴμοι, θρηνῶν, πενθῶ), and he convinces himself all too easily that the story must end in death; whereas, in fact, the concatenation of false deaths signals comedy (the serial aspect is emphasised here: ποσάκις, τῶν θανάτων διωκόντων ἀλλήλους). Clitophon's error is generic misidentification. It is fortunate that he has, by this stage, hooked up again with Clinias, who consoles him and attempts to prevent his premature suicide:

> Who knows whether she has come back to life? Has she not died many times before? Has she not been resurrected many times before? Why this haste to die? You will have plenty of leisure to do so when you discover for sure that she is dead.
>
> τίς γὰρ οἶδεν εἰ ζῇ πάλιν; μὴ γὰρ οὐ πολλάκις τέθνηκε; μὴ γὰρ οὐ πολλάκις ἀνεβίω; τί δὲ προπετῶς ἀποθνῄσκεις; ὃ καὶ κατὰ σχολὴν ἔξεστιν, ὅταν μάθῃς σαφῶς τὸν θάνατον αὐτῆς. (7.6.2)

Clinias benefits from an ability to see beyond the instant situation: one should not react "hastily" (προπετῶς) to the present situation, but wait until one is in full possession of the facts. We can again interpret Clinias' words as a self-reflexive meditation upon the art of novel-reading: a judicious reader of the novel should, like Clinias, interpret the hints concealed in narrative patterns, and understand the architectonics of *plot*. Elsewhere, Clinias tells Clitophon (who has just learned how close he was to permission to marry Leucippe before they set out) that "now is not the appropriate time (*kairos*) for lamentation" (οὐ θρήνων νῦν καιρός, 5.11.3): it is precisely this command of *kairos* that sets the virtuous Clinias apart from Clitophon, and gives him in particular the resources necessary to survive—and to *read*—the periodic adversity of novelistic narrative.

If we are casting Clitophon as a literary incompetent, it is interesting to note that he is the only character in a fully extant Greek

novel who is portrayed as reading anything other than a letter or an inscription. In a well-known passage, he describes how he ambled around the house with a book, "hunched over it to read; but whenever I reached her door, I peeked up surreptitiously" (... ἐγκεκυφὼς ἀνεγίνωσκον· τὸν δὲ ὀφθαλμόν, εἰ κατὰ τὰς θύρας γενοίμην, ὑπείλιττον κάτωθεν, 1.6.6). We are not told what book Clitophon is reading, but the temptation to suppose it is a λόγος ἐρωτικός is strong.[24] This episode is thus usually read in terms of Achilles' self-consciousness about the textuality of the narrative, "an elegant counterpoint to the telling of erotic tales."[25] But isn't it precisely the point that we don't know what the book is about? And that we don't know because Clitophon has no interest in the book *per se*?[26] In other words: if he had paid more attention to the book and less to ogling Leucippe, he might well have been better equipped to deal with fortune's tricks.

There is, however, a more complex, involved question concerning the degree to which the 'naïve' self-presentation of Clitophon the actor is inflected by the 'knowingness' of Clitophon the narrator – and this is where we rejoin the theme of the ambiguous narrator. The events of *Leucippe & Clitophon* constitute, for Clitophon, an object lesson in learning how to deal with novelistic narrative. By the time of the *telos* of the narrative, he is initiated (τετελεσμένος) into the wiles of narration, thus creating the Clitophon that we meet at the start as a narrator. Indeed, by the conclusion of the text, Clitophon has clearly learned a good deal about narration. When Leucippe's father asks him to recap the story for him (8.5), Clitophon replies with a devious account that manipulates events without actually lying:

> When I came to the part about Melite, I omitted my performance of the act, reshaping the story into one of chaste self-control, although I told no actual lies ... one of my actions in the plot alone I overlooked, namely the respect I subsequently paid to Melite.
>
> ἐπεὶ δὲ κατὰ τὴν Μελίτην ἐγενόμην, ἐξῆρον τὸ πρᾶγμα ἐμαυτοῦ πρὸς σωφροσύνην μεταποιῶν καὶ οὐδὲν ἐψευδόμην ... ἓν μόνον παρῆκα τῶν ἐμαυτοῦ δραμάτων, τὴν μετὰ ταῦτα πρὸς Μελίτην αἰδῶ. (8.5.2-3)

[24] Morales (1997) 15.
[25] Goldhill (1995) 70.
[26] Morales (1997) 16: "his reading is by no means unified or consistent."

Clitophon's devious self-censorship tracks that of the arch-narrator himself, Odysseus, who seems to pass over his sexual relationship with Circe (Homer, *Odyssey* 23.321). By using the word δραμάτων (δράματα seems to have been used for the genre of the romance, at the very least by Byzantine times),[27] Clitophon invites his readers to ponder the self-consciousness of his narrative *metapoiêsis* (another knowingly technical term).[28] What sort of a narrator is he now? Can we trust him? Moreover, his ironic use of the word αἰδώς—literally 'respect', 'shame' or 'reverence', but here with an oblique allusion to the αἰδοῖα ('genitalia')—reminds us that language can be masterfully crafted to suit the template of the wordsmith. *Erôs* is indeed, as Clinias told us, a teacher: he has taught Clitophon to conceal and dissimulate – without, of course, ever exactly *lying* ...

What we have so far is a neat pattern: the progress of Clitophon the agent to the *telos* of the narrative constitutes an education in novelistic practice (a genre already understood by his 'initiated' cousin Clinias), to the extent that at the close he is qualified to act as a narrator. Yet this neat pattern problematises itself when we begin to consider the implications of a sophisticated narrator (re)creating a naïve *persona*. What is disquieting for the reader about this new Clitophon, transformed from impetuous, unreflective *naïf* to Odyssean rhetorician, is that the construction of the *naïf* is always circumscribed by (and hence enfolded into) the knowing artifice of the mature initiate. At a narratological level, there are no explicit markers ("fool that I was!," *vel sim.*) in the early part of the text to indicate the uninitiated state of Clitophon the actor as distinct from the narrator: in other words, there is no visible index of the fissure with him between naïveté and knowingness. But the presence of the framing narrative that begins the text means that the reader can never forget that the status of youthful pre-initiate is a narrative construct; indeed—in a sense—a fake.

Naïve narration is always open to the charge of contrivance (the Lysias 1 syndrome). "How rotten and counterfeit," writes Marcus Aurelius, "is the man who says: 'I have made up my mind to deal plainly with you'" (ὡς σαπρὸς καὶ κίβδηλος ὁ λέγων· ἐγὼ

[27] Agapitos (1998a) 128-32; cf. Marini (1991).

[28] μεταποιέω is used for illicit tampering with authoritative texts, e.g. in a marginal note at *Hebrews* 1:3 (ἀμαθέστατε καὶ κακέ, ἄφες τὸν παλαιόν, μὴ μεταποίει, cited at Haines-Eitzen [2000] 110).

προῄρημαι ἁπλῶς σοι προσφέρεσθαι, *Med.* 11.15). And, indeed, there are hints throughout the text that Clitophon's naïveté is not quite what it seems. In the first book, he provides a conspicuous example of agenda-led narration, telling Leucippe about peacocks and attractions between magnets, rivers, and animals (1.16-19).[29] This is an exercise in insinuation and intimation, a conversation that communicates at the subverbal level: Satyrus, he tells us, "grasped the gist of my words" (συνεὶς τοῦ λόγου μου τὴν ὑπόθεσιν, 1.17.1) and provided him with a pretext for more talking; and then Leucippe "seemed to be signalling discreetly that the experience of listening was not without a certain pleasure" (ὑπεσήμαινεν οὐκ ἀηδῶς ἀκούειν, 1.19.1). Clitophon—and Satyrus and Leucippe too—are here adepts in reading artfully figured narration.

At a later point, in a well-known passage, Clitophon's narratorial sophistications are even more emphasised. He begins an account of the pleasures induced by sex with a woman with a striking *captatio benevolentiae*:

> my own experience with women is limited, extending only to intimacy with those who put Aphrodite up for sale. Perhaps someone else who has been initiated might be able to comment in somewhat greater detail; but I shall speak nevertheless, moderate though my experience be.
>
> ἐγὼ μὲν πρωτόπειρος ὢν εἰς γυναῖκας, ὅσον ὁμιλῆσαι ταῖς εἰς Ἀφροδίτην πωλουμέναις· ἄλλος γὰρ ἂν ἴσως εἰπεῖν τι καὶ πλέον ἔχοι μεμυημένος· εἰρήσεται δέ μοι, κἂν μετρίως ἔχω πείρας (2.37.5).

So Clitophon is not "initiated" (*memuêmenos*) – despite having slept with prostitutes ... In shifting the definitional goal-posts so ingeniously, Clitophon is actually pointing up his own experience and ingenuity. Are these the words of a *naïf*? Surely not, because Clitophon is patently employing the oldest rhetorical trick in the book, the 'unaccustomed as I am to public speaking' *topos*.[30] Little wonder that Clinias replies "Well, as far as I can tell, you are no inexperienced youngster but an old hand in Aphrodite's game!" (ἀλλὰ σύ μοι δοκεῖς ... μὴ πρωτόπειρος ἀλλὰ γέρων εἰς Ἀφροδίτην τυγχάνειν, 2.38.1). In this sophistical context, to claim naïveté is a gambit in a

[29] See further Morales (1995).
[30] Noted by Goldhill (1995) 85.

larger (and inherently sophisticated) game of arrogation of cultural authority.

So the naïveté of Clitophon the agent looks like being itself a sophisticated rhetorical effect, an ingenious, quasi-Lysianic construction effected by an erotic sophist. Indeed, as is well-known, Achilles deliberately marks the disjunction between Clitophon the agent in the novel's narrative and Clitophon the narrator we meet at the start. How did Clitophon get from married bliss in Byzantium (where the novel closes, 8.19.3) to solitary bewailing in Sidon (where the novel starts)?[31] What happened after the end of the narrative? Why do we get no explanation of the way that Clitophon is now? Achilles underscores the narrational disjunction between Clitophon the narrator and Clitophon his self-cited, 'fictional' construct: this is the starkest instance in the novel of narratorial distance, irony in its most pungent form.

We also need to nuance our account of Clinias, for he is not *always* the aloof sophisticate. The role of adept reader that Clinias plays in the heterosexual narrative is not one that he can assume in a pederastic context. When he hears of the impending marriage of his boyfriend, Clinias "wails" (συνεστέναξεν, 1.7.4), before launching into a hopelessly overstated attack upon marriage and the γένος γυναικῶν (1.8). That this oration is packed with Hesiodic and Semonidean clichés only underlines its absurdity. Clitophon later tells us that Clinias habitually pronounces κατὰ γυναικῶν (2.35.2).[32] An oration inveighing against women and marriage – *in a novel*??! Clinias, in fact, seems to be occupied by a novella of his own, a pederastic parallel universe. When he learns of the death of his boyfriend, Charicles, his response—immobility (1.12.2), followed by a shriek (ἐκώκυσε, 1.13.1) and a lament (θρήνων ἅμιλλα, 1.14.1)—foreshadows directly that of Clitophon to news of Leucippe's death (3.15.5-6; 7.4.3-6). Clinias allows us partial access to an alternative eroticism, a narrative in which tragedy really does dominate. Yet just as Clinias is disengaged from the heterosexual plot, so Clitophon has no interest whatsoever in the death of Charicles. The narrative transition from Clinias' impassioned lamentation is so brutal that a tex-

[31] The older presumption of textual corruption is too hasty: see e.g. Most (1989) for discussion and further references, but (to my mind) an unsatisfactory appeal to cultural relativism to 'solve' the problem.

[32] On this tradition, see Braund (1992).

tual lacuna has been suspected:[33] “After the burial, I immediately set off hurriedly to see the girl” (μετὰ δὲ τὴν ταφὴν εὐθὺς ἔσπευδον ἐπὶ τὴν κόρην, 1.15.1). Like Clitophon, the narrative also hurries, betraying an indecent haste. What burial? How can Clitophon be so insensitive towards the cousin who advised him?

So Clitophon is detached and disengaged from the pederastic narrative, just as Clinias is from the heterosexual. In the pseudo-Lucianic *Dialogue on love*, a pederast and a heterosexual famously praise the statue of Aphrodite at Cnidos, the one standing behind it and the other in front.[34] Aside from the risqué (and theologically daring) wit, the central attraction of this memorable scene lies in its crystallisation of an issue of interpretation: different viewers can successfully project their different desires onto the same artefact.[35] I suggest that this is a principle that lies at the heart of Achilles’ *Leucippe & Clitophon*. Achilles explores and invites a range of responses to his text, from engagement—a hyperaffective overexcitement at every narrative twist and turn—to a radical disengagement that can be motivated either by aloof knowingness or by apathetic agnosticism. In particular, though, these responses are constructed along sexual lines: pederasts do not engage with heterosexual narratives.

Let us return to the proposition that Clinias is a detached, mature, ‘novelised’ expert. Is Clinias the pederast really the ideal implied reader of heterosexual fiction? Would there be any pleasures for us in reading like Clinias? A passage in Plutarch’s *How a young man should listen to poetry* may prove instructive:

> Changes in narrative direction furnish stories with an empathetic, surprising (*paralogon*) and unexpected quality. This is what generates the maximum shock and pleasure.

---

[33] Pearcy (1978).

[34] See Halperin (1994), emphasizing broadly that the differences between pederastic and heterosexual are matters more of ‘style’ than of inner nature; also Goldhill (1995) 102-9.

[35] A common narrative function of statues in ancient erotic discourse: “statues are almost limitlessly readable – we encode our own patterns, our own desires upon them” (Hunter [1994] 1076).

> τὸ γὰρ ἐμπαθὲς καὶ παράλογον καὶ ἀπροσδόκητον, ᾧ πλείστη μὲν ἔκπληξις ἕπεται πλείστη δὲ χάρις, αἱ μεταβολαὶ παρέχουσι τοῖς μύθοις (25d).[36]

These are precisely the joys of novel-reading; but Clinias' thoughtful, disengaged responses risk robbing him of such intense, affective reaction. Do we the readers want to give up our literary pleasures for (what we might call) Clinian analysis? Do we want to be able to predict every lurid twist and turn of a narrative that prides itself on "innovative surprise" (καινὰ καὶ παράλογα)?[37]

Achilles proposes a range of responses to his text, from hyperaffective excess to sophisticated aloofness. As guides to novel-reading, however, neither the naïve Clitophon nor the knowing Clinias is privileged. Both are arguably ironised, held at a distance, by the concealed author of the text: Clitophon's naïveté is exploited for comic effect, and exposed as a rhetorical construct on the part of the 'initiated' narrator; Clinias' disengaged aloofness (born of his pederastic perspective upon a heterosexual narrative) makes him no more acute a reader of *Leucippe & Clitophon* than Clitophon is of *Charicles and Clinias*. The implied position for the reader's novelism is in the dynamic middle ground between these two poles, between emotional overload and hypersophisticated knowingness. 'Novelism', for readers, consists in an ability to switch between mental frames, between over-determined generic awareness and the naïve affect of the first-time lover.

Achilles' technique of ego-narration is, then, sophisticated, complex and thrillingly inventive. Although the opening frame of the text encourages readers to take pleasure in the disjunction between the naïveté of the youthful actor and the knowingness of the mature, novelistically-experienced narrator (and hence the implied reader, too), Achilles constantly mobilises hints and insinuations that undermine the reader's confidence in that framework of reference. Is Clitophon *really* that innocent? How much do *we* really know? And is it really in our interests, as novelistic thrill-seekers (if, indeed, that

---

[36] See further Van der Stockt (1992) 125-6, pointing to the tensions between this 'objective' (as he calls it) assessment of poetry and the 'admonishments' elsewhere in the tract. See also *De tranqu. an.* 475a for poetry narrating τὸ παρὰ προσδοκίαν.

[37] παράλογος: 4.14.5; 4.14.8; 5.1.6; 5.23.5; 6.2.8; 6.4.3; καινός (listing only the uses meaning 'of a novel kind'): 1.9.5; 2.14.4; 3.3.3; 3.16.4; 4.4.6; 4.7.15; 4.12.1; 4.14.8 (*bis*); 5.1.6; 5.14.4; 6.7.3; 6.21.2. Also παράδοξος: 2.18.6; 4.4.1; 6.2.3. See further Anderson (1993) 163-5; Whitmarsh (2001) 79-80.

is what we are), to cultivate the supercilious detachment of a Clinias? These are the questions continually probed by *Leucippe & Clitophon*, this wonderful, narratologically opulent, and self-consciously readerly text.

This page intentionally left blank

THE WINGED ASS. INTERTEXTUALITY AND NARRATION IN APULEIUS' *METAMORPHOSES*

Luca Graverini

Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*, as Ellen Finkelpearl has pointed out in her recent book,[1] contains a number of passages that can also be interpreted as reflections about the 'Novel' and the features of this new and unstable literary genre; it is also possible to encounter images which are well suited to symbolizing the lively coexistence of the 'high' and 'low' intertexts that characterize it. I do not presume to attribute such a symbolic valency to Apuleius himself; though I have chosen for the title of this study the image of the winged ass acting the part of Pegasus (the character which closes the prelude to the great Isiac procession[2]): a zoological and literary hybrid which incorporates the features of the lowest animality as well as ethereal divine immortality. I also intend to conclude my paper by proposing a related but different image, in a manner that is more circumstantial and coherent with the subject.

At this point I would like to proceed to an intertextual analysis of certain passages in the *Metamorphoses* connected with the act of narrating, which is, of course, quite a common situation in a novel so rich in stories inserted into the main plot. Quite a number of these secondary narrations seem to be a sort of experimentation by Apuleius with different literary genres; in some cases they are also prefaced by more or less explicit genre markers. It is not possible here to list many examples, but it is worth mentioning at least the apostrophe to the reader in 10.2.4 where Lucius says "know that you

---

[1] Finkelpearl (1998); cf. e.g. pp. 58 ff. ("Self-Conscious Reflection on Epic, Novel, and Genre") and 62 ff. ("Hair, Elegy, and Style").

[2] *Metamorphoses* 11.8.4: "I saw… an ass with wings glued on his back, walking aside a decrepit old man, so that you would call the one Bellerophon and the other Pegasus, but laugh at both." All translations of Greek and Latin texts are from the Loeb collection: Hanson (1989), Apuleius; Seaton (1912), Apollonius Rhodius; Murray (1919), Homer; Fairclough (1926), Horace; Fairclough-Goold (1999), Vergil. The Latin text of Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* is from Robertson, Vallette (1940-45).

are reading a tragedy, and no light tale,"[3] or the story of Lucius' service with the gardener, which is rich in references to historiographic literature, and is introduced in 9.32.1 with an *incipit* of clear Sallustian flavour: "circumstances require me, I think, to describe the regime of this new slavery of mine as well."[4]

The most extensive tale inserted in the *Metamorphoses* is the well-known fable of *Cupid and Psyche*. The story is narrated because of its power to distract and comfort a character, Charite, who had been kidnapped by brigands just as she was about to get married; twice the girl bursts into tears (4.24.3; 4.25.1), and tells what happened to her (4.24.4-5; 4.26.3-8). To make matters worse, the poor girl relives her misfortunes in a dream (4.27.2-4). An old woman, whom the brigands had asked to look after Charite and keep her calm, maintains that it is not worth worrying about bad dreams since they often foretell quite opposite events. She then begins to entertain the girl and to renew her hope with the long tale of *Cupid and Psyche*, whose main character, after living some frightening adventures, succeeds in realizing her own love dream.[5]

The narrative is very rich in associations with a multiplicity of literary texts and genres. Nevertheless, Stephen Harrison, among others, has clearly highlighted the dominating role assumed by the epic model, on a structural, narratological and textual level.[6] Because of its distinctive feature of being a 'long inserted tale' *Cupid and Psyche* can usefully be compared, at least structurally, with books 2 and 3 of the *Aeneid*, where the Vergilian hero recounts his own wanderings to Dido; but—as Harrison correctly points out—the very choice of the narrator represents a first important point of divergence which transforms "the lofty world of the epic into the more dubious domain of the novel."[7] In place of Aeneas we find a "crazy, drunken old

[3] *Scito te tragoediam, non fabulam legere*. Cf. e.g. *GCA* (2000) *ad loc.*: "it is clear to any lettered reader that he must watch for references to the Phaedra-Hippolytus tragedy."

[4] *Res ipsa mihi poscere videtur ut huius quoque serviti mei disciplinam exponam*. About this kind of historiographical *incipit*, see Graverini (1997) 248-54.

[5] Winkler (1985) 56 sees a malicious purpose in the old woman's story: "the narrator is Charite's enemy and her tale is specifically designed to lull her fears by using a mirror image to turn her away from reality." The dream of Charite seems to conceal many hints about the events that will be narrated in Book 8: see Frangoulidis (1993).

[6] Harrison (1998a) 52 ff.; Smith (1998) 73 ff. prefers to stress the connections with the genre of tragedy.

[7] Harrison (1998a) 53.

woman" (*delira et temulenta… anicula*: we will come back to the two adjectives later on), a female character who is quite secondary in the economy of the novel. Her tale is heterodiegetic and—at least from a superficial reading—its subject is fantastic and frivolous, whereas the story told by Aeneas is homodiegetic, and its subject matter heroic and military.

Yet, it should be noted that, although there is certainly a strong opposition between the old woman and the narrator Aeneas, the fact that *Cupid and Psyche* is a tale of entertainment does not necessarily take us very far from the world of the epic. The three songs of Demodocus in *Odyssey* Book 8, for example, enliven the banquets and the athletic games of the Phaeacians, even though they have no consolatory purpose. And if we want to go even further with the analogies, we can point out that they are heterodiegetic narratives, and that in the second case the subject (the illicit love affair between Ares and Aphrodite) is not at all 'epic'. The first and the last songs of Demodocus deal instead with the Trojan war, and both of them spark an emotional response from Odysseus. In the first case (vv. 83-92) the hero repeatedly covers his head with his cloak, so as to hide his tears from the Phaeacians; yet the fact does not pass unnoticed by Alcinous, who interrupts the banquet out of respect for his guest. When Odysseus sheds tears for the second time (vv. 521-31) Alcinous, who is still unaware of his guest's true identity, asks him who he is and why he is there; thus Odysseus begins his long narration, occupying books 9 to 12. So, as in Apuleius, in *Odyssey* Book 8 we find a tale (by Demodocus) and a moment of tears (by Odysseus) that are preludes to a long inserted tale. Odysseus' tears initially provoke the opposite reaction to those of Charite, since they cause the interruption of Demodocus' song. Nevertheless, it is those very tears that, through Alcinous' intervention, will lead to the long tale in the following books.[8]

---

[8] In Vergil, the corresponding tale narrated by Aeneas to Dido is also preceded by the performance of a minstrel, but there is no causal connection since Iopas' song has a cosmological content. Thus Aeneas has no reason for being deeply moved like Odysseus at the banquet; the scene of the crying hero is instead exploited by Vergil when Aeneas, while still invisible and alone with Achates, admires the scenes of the Trojan War portrayed on Iuno's temple in Carthage (1.459 ff.; cfr. also 2.8). As I will try to demonstrate in the following pages, the *Odyssey* provides a more specific intertext than the *Aeneid* for our Apuleian passage.

A useful comparison can be drawn between the repeated weeping of Odysseus, broken by the athletic games, and Charite's tears, which are also repeated and interrupted by a short sleep. The last time Odysseus weeps is described by Homer through a simile (*Odyssey* 8.521 ff.):

> This song the famous minstrel sang. But the heart of Odysseus was melted and tears wet his cheeks beneath his eyelids. And *as a woman* wails and flings herself about her dear *husband*, who has fallen *in front of his city and his people*, seeking to ward off from his city and his children the pitiless day; and *as she beholds him dying and gasping for breath*, she clings to him and shrieks aloud, while the foe behind her smite her back and shoulders with their spears, and *lead her away to captivity* to bear toil and woe, while with most pitiful grief her cheeks are wasted: even so did Odysseus let fall pitiful tears from beneath his brows.

Charite, who has just awakened in tears, tells the brigands' old servant how she had been kidnapped (4.26.3 ff.), and immediately afterwards she describes her terrifying dream. This dream follows the previous narrative closely enough, but is different from it in at least a couple of important details: in the dream Charite sees herself as already married (whereas in 4.26.8 she had recounted that she had been kidnapped "right from my mother's trembling arms": that is, before the wedding); and the bridegroom dies while pursuing the kidnappers and urging the people to do the same (whereas the 'real' kidnapping took place without anyone daring to oppose the brigands, and as far as we can see it occurred in a purely domestic context). Here is the text (4.27.2 ff.):

> I saw myself, after I had been dragged violently from my house, my bridal apartment, my room, my very bed, calling my poor luckless *husband*'s name through the trackless wilds. And I saw him, the moment he was widowed of my embraces, still wet with perfumes and garlanded with flowers, following my tracks as I fled on others' feet. As with pitiful cries he lamented his lovely *wife*'s kidnapping and *called on the populace for aid*, one of the robbers, furious at his annoying pursuit, picked up a huge stone at his feet, struck my unhappy young *husband*, and *killed him. It was this hideous vision that terrified me* and shook me out of my deathly sleep.[9]

[9] *…visa sum mihi de domo de thalamo de cubiculo de toro denique ipso violenter extracta per solitudines avias infortunatissimi mariti nomen invocare, eumque, ut primum meis amplexibus viduatus est, adhuc ungentis madidum coronis floridum*

Of course there are some differences, but the nucleus is closely similar to the Homeric comparison. In her dream Charite, like the woman in the *Odyssey*, is kidnapped and is upset by the sight of her husband's death. This episode does not appear to happen in private, but in front of the people of the town. So it is precisely the details that differentiate Charite's dream from the 'reality' which link the oneiric vision to the Homeric text. Other less important analogies can be found in these chapters: Charite thinks that her own destiny is to become a slave (4.24.4 "turned into a slave," *mancipium effecta*); the brigands' attack is described as if it were a military episode, as is customary in Apuleius (4.26.7 "suddenly a gang of gladiators came bursting in, fierce with the look of war, brandishing their bared and hostile blades"). If the comparison between the two texts is right, an ornamental detail in the epic becomes a narrative element in Apuleius (albeit indirectly, as in the case of a dream); it is an interesting practice, other examples of which could be found in the *Metamorphoses*.[10]

In a sense Charite's dream represents a sublime re-narration of the misfortunes she underwent. Her kidnapping, as she had previously narrated it, had not brought about any heroic acts, and it would seem the maiden herself regrets it ("no one in our household fought back, or even offered the slightest resistance," 4.26.8); it is true that the tale ends with a mythological comparison ("thus our wedding, like that of Attis or Protesilaus, was interrupted and broken up"), but this serves mainly to highlight, by means of elegiac tones, how pathetic Charite's situation is. In her dream, however, thanks to the modification of certain details and to the closeness to the Homeric text, Charite can try to dignify her own adventure by joining the number

---

consequi vestigio me pedibus fugientem alienis. Utque clamore percito formonsae raptum uxoris conquerens populi testatur auxilium, quidam de latronibus importunae persecutionis indignatione permotus saxo grandi pro pedibus adrepto misellum iuvenem maritum meum percussum interemit. Talis aspectus atrocitate perterrita somno funesto pavens excussa sum.

[10] This imitative technique has been first described by Finkelpearl (1998) 57 f.: the scene of the ass freely wandering in the fields (*Metamorphoses* 7.16.2 *at ego tandem liber asinus*) recalls a Vergilian simile describing Turnus' eagerness to join the battle (*Aeneid* 11,492 ff. *qualis… tandem liber equus*). I offered another example in Graverini (1998) 142 f.: the episode narrated at 8.17.1 ff. (the slaves, with whom the ass is travelling, are attacked by a group of peasants, until one of them obtains peace with a pathetic speech) echoes the very first simile in the *Aeneid* (1.148-53: the sea is calmed by Neptune, just like a rebellion is soothed by the sight of "a man honoured for noble character and service," *pietate gravem ac meritis… virum*).

of epic heroines who lament their kidnapping, desertion or widowhood.

It is worth remembering here a couple of examples of the *topos* deriving from our Homeric simile. A female adaptation of it can be found in Apollonius Rhodius' Medea. The heroine dreams of getting married and fleeing with Jason, but she wakes up terrified by a feeling of imminent misfortune; so,

> As when a bride in her chamber bewails her youthful husband, to whom her brothers and parents have given her … and some doom has destroyed him, before they have had the pleasure of each other's charms; and she with heart on fire silently weeps, beholding her widowed couch… like her did Medea lament (3.656 ff.).

These verses seem to constitute an extremely interesting link between Homer and Apuleius, given the connection between the weeping and the dream as well as the application of Ulyssean features to a female character, while the Homeric simile of the crying woman is re-elaborated with the introduction of the element of the unfulfilled marriage.

Maybe it is worth taking a step along the path of literary imitation, to move from Ulysses and Medea to Dido. Vergil describes her dream in *Aeneid* 4.465 ff., a passage that shows certain textual similarities with Apuleius:

> In her sleep fierce Aeneas himself drives her in her frenzy; and ever she seems to be left lonely, ever wending, companionless, an endless way, and seeking her Tyrians in a land forlorn (*agit ipse furentem / in somnis ferus Aeneas, semperque relinqui / sola sibi, semper longam incomitata videtur / ire viam et Tyrios deserta quaerere terra*).

If we read again the words with which Charite begins to narrate her own dream,

> I saw myself, after I had been dragged violently from my house… calling my poor luckless husband's name through the trackless wilds (*nam visa sum mihi de domo … violenter extracta per solitudines avias infortunatissimi mariti nomen invocare*).

we can note a generic lexical similarity (*visa sum mihi… invocare / sibi … videtur… quaerere*), and the shared insistence on the woman's solitude.[11] Thus Charite relives her adventures in her dream,

[11] A feature that the dreams of Dido and Charite share also with that of Ilia in Ennius, *Annals* 1.25 ff.: *ita sola… errare videbar… et quaerere te.* See Mignogna

though distorted by the literary filter. If we adapt the critical terminology elaborated by Gian Biagio Conte[12] for Petronius' characters to our own case, we could define Charite as a 'mythomaniac dreamer'.

Stephen Harrison notes that "as the primary narratee of Cupid and Psyche, Charite clearly bears some resemblance to Dido, the primary narratee of Aeneas' narrative."[13] This is of course only a first instance of an analogy which Apuleius will develop thoroughly in Book 8;[14] to this we can now add the parallel between the dream of the two heroines. However, we are still at the very beginning of this process of identification, and her character is not yet clearly defined. The crying Charite, therefore, also exhibits some characteristic features of Odysseus, in particular the more feminine ones, and those more likely to be assimilated by a female character: pain, tears, homesickness (*Metamorphoses* 4.24.4: "Poor me,… torn from a wonderful house, my big household, my dear servants, and my honorable parents"; *Odyssey* 9.34 "nought is sweeter than a man's own land and his parents"). What is more, Charite's tragedy of separation from a lover is shared by Odysseus at the court of Alcinous not in one but in two respects. Besides the forced separation from Ithaca and Penelope, the missed marriage of the hero with Nausicaa has been seen since ancient times as somehow regrettable, as it would have been appreciated by Nausicaa, Alcinous, and (maybe) Odysseus himself: so much so that Hellanicus (*FGrH* 1a, F. 156) tried to put matters right by getting Nausicaa to marry Telemachus.

Charite's dream and tears not only have the function of introducing a narrative digression; thanks to the comparison with Odysseus' crying and with the other literary models examined above, they also seem to provide some early information about the main features of the tale that will be narrated immediately after. Indeed, the old woman is unexpectedly able to adapt herself to Charite's expressive register: in so doing she narrates an adventure with an epic flavour, but with many

(1996) 98 for the parallel with Ennius, and *GCA* (1977) 204 for the analogy with Dido's dream. As regards the obvious links between Dido and Apollonius' Medea, already noted in Macrobius, *Saturnalia* 5.17.4, see e.g. Pease (1935) 13-14.

[12] Conte (1997).

[13] Harrison (1998a) 55.

[14] The parallel between the two characters has been well pointed out by Forbes (1943); but see also the important discussion in Finkelpearl (1998) 115-48.

'feminine', sentimental and novelistic features. The character Psyche herself, with whom the old woman would obviously like Charite to identify, clearly exhibits many other 'Ulyssean' features: in fact, she will be the protagonist of adventures that are traditionally a prerogative of the epic hero, such as the descent to the underworld; like Odysseus and Aeneas she will be persecuted by the wrath of a goddess, and like Aeneas she will be deified. But she will also be involved in a tragic love affair (a secondary, though not unrelated element in the characterization of the Homeric or Vergilian hero), and will suffer a long and painful separation from her husband.

As I have already stated above, it is difficult to compare the old woman to the narrating Odysseus or Aeneas. Her being a minor character and the fact that her tale is heterodiegetic, epic and entertaining could perhaps bring her very close to a singer such as Demodocus; but the text itself does not seem to suggest this comparison explicitly. However, it is clear that it is precisely her role as an heterodiegetic, omniscient narrator that enables her to insert a divine apparatus, with the wrath of Venus working as the motor of events. An example of such a narrator is Phemius in *Odyssey* 1.338, whose songs were about "deeds of men and gods."

Finally, we should consider again the epithets *delira et temulenta* (6.25.1) with which Lucius, at the end of *Cupid and Psyche*, qualifies the old narrator by using the insults the robbers had hurled at the woman in 4.7.3. It is probably not out of place if we go beyond the literal sense of these words, and note that *furor* and inebriety are traditionally characteristics suitable for a poet, especially an epic poet. As an example, it is sufficient to quote Horace, *Epistles* 1.19.6-8

> From the moment Liber enlisted brain-sick poets among his Satyrs and Fauns, the sweet Muses, as a rule, have had a scent of wine about them in the morning. Homer, by his praises of wine, is convicted as a winebibber. Even Father Ennius never sprang forth to tell of arms save after much drinking.[15]

[15] *Ut male sanos / adscripsit Liber Satyris Faunisque poetas, / vina fere dulces oluerunt mane Camenae. / Laudibus arguitur vini vinosus Homerus: / Ennius ipse pater numquam nisi potus ad arma / prosiluit dicenda.* For a discussion of the topos, and a list of useful parallels, see Mayer (1994) 259; Nisbet, Hubbard (1978) 316 on Horace, *Odes* 2.19; *GCA* (1981) 24 f. on *Metamorphoses* 6.25.1 (the commentators also note that the characterization of the old woman as *temulenta* could be "a veiled hint that the tale has a deeper meaning").

Thus Lucius' words, at the end of a tale endowed with such a refined literary texture, can be considered as a sort of unintentional gloss, an ironic acknowledgement of the unexpected narrative talent of the brigands' old servant.[16]

Besides the old woman, the only 'Demodocean' narrator, there are also many narrators in the *Metamorphoses* who could be defined 'Ulyssean'; a rough list could include the robbers, Thelyphron, and of course Lucius himself. In *Metamorphoses* 2.14.1-3 Diophanes, a charlatan fortune-teller, narrates his adventures to a friend he had casually met in the public square, calling them a "really Odyssean voyage," *Ulixea peregrinatio*:[17] it is a story of journeys, tempests, shipwrecks and brigands. The tale is short and in the first person, so that no divine apparatus can be found there. This is a feature that differentiates Diophanes' narration from *Cupid and Psyche*, but is common, for example, to the homodiegetic parts of the *Odyssey* and the *Aeneid*. In this kind of narration the adventures and sufferings of the main character are brought into the foreground with greater vividness, and it seems that they are dominated more by a blind fate than by providence or destiny. In particular, I believe that such 'short Odysseys' in the novel, narrated in the first person, can be connected not so much to the lengthy tale recounted by Odysseus to the Phaeacians but rather to the short tales the hero told when he reached Ithaca, where he pretends to be a Cretan reduced to poverty. They too are tales about journeys, pirates, tempests and betrayals, in which the gods play an almost non-existent and completely conventional role: real miniature novels (*Odyssey* 13.256 ff.; 14.199-359; 17.419 ff.; 19.165 ff. Cf. also Theron's repeated false claim to being an ill-fated Cretan traveller in Chariton 3.3.17 ff.).

They are of course thoroughly mendacious narratives,[18] to the point that Athena, to whom Odysseus had unwittingly told the first of these tales, defines him "bold man, crafty in counsel, insatiate in deceit" (*Odyssey* 13.293). The status of liar is perfectly suited to the charlatan Diophanes though, while he usually lies in his role of

---

[16] For the topos of madness in the epic poet, cf. Hershkowitz (1998) 61-7.

[17] Cf. Graverini (1998) 139 f. for some Vergilian and Homeric echoes in Diophanes' narration.

[18] As regards the narrative strategies involved in these false stories, and for a comparison between them and the ancient novels, see Barchiesi (1997) 126 ff.

prophet, it would appear that he tells the truth when he narrates his own adventures. He does so to the extent that it is precisely his improvident narration before the people that undermines his credibility as a fortune-teller – one who has been unable to avoid even his own misfortunes.[19] As J. Winkler has shown, to disguise truth as lies and vice versa seems to be a favourite artifice of Apuleius and his characters.[20]

Odysseus tells all his Cretan stories but the first one after having been transformed by Athena into a ragged beggar: this can remind us of another 'short Odyssey' contained in the *Metamorphoses*. During a business trip Socrates is first robbed by a gang of thieves, then trapped in a ruinous sexual affair with an old woman, Meroe, who—we will discover later—is a powerful witch. It is therefore impossible for him to return home, where his wife believes him to be dead and is about to remarry. His friend Aristomenes meets him at Hypata, almost unrecognizable on account of his pallor, thinness and ragged clothes: he decides to help him, and to bring him back to his homeland, but he has to deal with the old witch, who refuses to be abandoned. A comparison with Odysseus, already suggested by the narrative itself, is also justified by the old witch's angry words: "shall I, forsooth, deserted like Calypso by the astuteness of a Ulysses, weep in everlasting loneliness?" (1.12.6). Aristomenes dresses, washes and feeds the friend (and it is difficult not to recall the attentions of Eurycleia and other maidservants on Odysseus in *Odyssey* 19.317 ff. and 503 ff.); Socrates at last finds the strength to tell him his adventures (1.7.5 ff.).

In this context, we should not be surprised by the fact that, when Aristomenes meets Socrates and reminds him of his country and family, Socrates' behaviour makes him look like Odysseus. At the beginning of this essay we considered the Homeric hero's reaction to the third song of Demodocus; now we can read the description of the first time Odysseus cries (*Odyssey* 8.83 ff.):

> This song the famous minstrel sang; but Odysseus grasped his great purple cloak with his stout hands, and drew it down over his head, and hid his comely face; for he had shame of the Phaeacians as he let fall

[19] About this complex situation, see *GCA* (2001) 212 f. and Graverini (2001) 184 ff.

[20] Winkler (1985) 121 f.; on Diophanes, 39-44. See also Laird (1990) 164; Laird (1993).

> tears from beneath his eyebrows. Yea, and as often as the divine minstrel ceased his singing, Odysseus would wipe away his tears and draw the cloak from off his head, and taking the two-handled cup would pour libations to the gods. But as often as he began again, and the nobles of the Phaeacians bade him sing, because they took pleasure in his lay, Odysseus would again cover his head and moan.

Socrates behaves exactly the same way: "he covered his face, which had long since begun to redden from shame, with his patched cloak" (*sutili centunculo faciem suam iam dudum punicantem prae pudore obtexit*, 1.6.4).[21] As regards the "great purple cloak" of Odysseus, there remains in Socrates only the purple blush of shame and a miserable *centunculus*, clearly much less abundant and not suited at all to the situation. Apuleius in fact goes on: "…baring the rest of his body from his navel to his loins" (*ita ut ab umbilico pube tenus cetera corporis renudaret*). The desperate and half-naked Socrates becomes, like the winged ass, a perfect image of the degradation of epic poetry into the novel, of the simultaneous presence of *pathos* and *bathos* which is one of the most remarkable features of Apuleius' work; and with his patched mantel he can symbolically recall the programmatic declaration of the novel's prologue, "I would like to tie together (*conserere*) different sorts of tales for you in that Milesian style of yours."

Apuleius' novel, as we have seen, introduces many narrating characters who are provided with different features. Only one of them, the old drunken housekeeper who narrates the tale of Cupid and Psyche, is a heterodiegetic and omniscient narrator (like Demodocus, and Homer himself); all the others, including the main character Lucius, have the more limited perspective of 'I-narrators'. The narrative often exploits the epic intertext, and sometimes tends to expand and

[21] Of course, for the whole tale of Aristomenes as well as for this particular scene, the Platonic model has also a remarkable importance: see e.g. Mattiacci (2001) 482 and Smith, Woods (2000) 112. In *Phaedrus* 237a the philosopher, beginning a speech about Love, covers his head, since the sight of his friend makes him feel embarrassed: the behavior of the Apuleian character, given his name and the love affair which caused his misfortunes, is clearly related to Plato's text. Anyway, there are some elements (e.g. the grief caused to Socrates by the memory of his misfortunes, and the following narration of them) which our passage shares with the *Odyssey*, and not with the *Phaedrus*; and it could be noted that also in the *Phaedrus* Socrates begins his speech with a mock-poetic (dithyramb-like, for Reale [1998] *ad loc.*) invocation to the Muses. So, the combination of two different (but not completely unrelated) models is not surprising in Apuleius.

give prominence to ‘minor’ episodes and ornamental details; in particular, Odysseus weeping at the banquet of Alcinous somehow lives again in the characters of Charite and Socrates. However, the apparently inconspicuous move from the supposed birthplace of Homer, Ionian Chius, to Ionian Miletus, where Apuleius declares his style originated, involves a radical metamorphosis in the characterization of heroes and narrators: the physical and spiritual virtues typically shown by the epic hero are replaced by more bourgeois and everyday features.[22]

[22] I am grateful to Alessandro Barchiesi and Marco Fucecchi for their helpful advice. Errors and omissions, of course, fall to my own account.

TLEPOLEMUS THE SPECTRAL SPOUSE

Donald Lateiner

Apuleius inserts the unhappy romance of 'Charite and Tlepolemus' before and after the doubly inserted, superficially happier[1] romance of 'Cupid and Psyche.' The latter half of the tale provides a Latin unromantic romance—sometimes tragic, sometimes comic (cf. 10.2)—not, in any case, an 'ideal' Greek romance.[2] All three principals meet untimely deaths: one murder, one vengeful and dire mutilation, and two suicides. This paper examines the mythical and literary (but not visual-art) antecedents of the spectral return of the anxious, dead spouse, Tlepolemus. It considers Apuleius' Greek and Latin predecessors who feature marriages spoiled early and consequent spectral spousal visits. It analyzes the purposes of those earlier 'ghosts'' return. It compares this apparition to Apuleius' other spousal phantoms. Finally, the tragic, comic, and unexpected turns that this couple's post-marital story takes illuminates how Apuleius values the experience of mundane marriage. Thus, this paper will argue that the newly invented segment of the tale functions as yet another condemnation of earthly attachments, although one still sympathetic (like 'Cupid and Psyche') to the possibility of briefly enjoyed *amor coniugalis*.

The unexpected arrival home of *living* husbands provides a comic motif in many bawdy 'young wives' tales. In ancient literatures, the tale-type develops in the Roman adultery mime and in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*.[3] Cuckolded husbands unexpectedly return in several

---

[1] Penwill (1998) 175 ably argues that the Olympian happy ending constitutes another Isiac parody of pagan divinities' gratification of sexual appetites—*serviles voluptates*—not a Platonic or other allegory. Psyche remains "nothing more than the sex-object" that she originally was (181 n.67).

[2] I think that we now realize that this genus of 'ideal romance' perhaps contains no fully conforming examples or species, but the paradigm constructed by Rohde, Reardon, and others from themes, incidents, and other bits found in the 'Big 5' still remains a useful and recognizable type.

[3] The homecoming husband offers a major motif in world folklore from the romantic *Odyssey* onwards; see Thompson (^{2}1961) 505-8; Thompson (1955-58) AT 974; cf. Hansen (1997). Bechtle (1995) examines echoes of the Roman adultery mime in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* 9. The motif of visions of spouses, especially the grateful dead, is also common; cf. Hansen (1996), Felton (1999); less helpful: Fran-

'inserted' Apuleian tales: the wife who 'sells' the pauper's clay storage-jar, the wife who hides her lover in the fuller's sulfurous cage, and her friend the wife who hides Philesitherus under the miller's wooden tub. These sexual escapades, one successful and two discovered, produce entrapment and claustrophobic climaxes for simple *novellae* (9.5, 23, 24). Barbarus' unexpected return, while his wife Arete and Philesitherus are adulterously occupied (9.20), provides another, differently unsuccessful tale of female sexual infidelity.

Apuleius' 'Charite complex,'[4] however, repeatedly revises, inverts (male/ female, violator/ victim), and perverts the jolly (*lepida*, 9.4) themes of marital infidelity as found in Milesian (1.1, 4.32) and Petronian instances. This story's dead and repeatedly departed husband and its mythic antecedents (especially Protesilaus and Laodameia) provide complicated tragicomedy. Charite's many 'suitors' emphasize the destructive power of her beauty and their lust and greed. Her tale realizes the Greek Romances' often expressed, although never therein consummated, tragic preference for death before dishonor. Xenophon's Anthia and Heliodorus' Charicleia, for instance, exhibit similar suicidal devotion but avoid the need to pursue the sincere intention.[5]

The unmarried *virgo* Charite is abducted (*extracta*, *raptum uxoris*) from her house during the marital rites. The robbers' rape-abduction (4.26) interrupts a phase of the legal wedding to her cousin, escorting to the husband's house (*domum deductio*: see Papaioannou [1998]). The noble[6] couple's marriage faces further threats: the desirable (*concupiscendam*) bride reasonably fears sexual violation (cf. Lateiner [1997/2000] 410-16). The bandits' reassurance, that they want only ransom, fails to persuade their booty (*praeda*), the trafficked female (4.23-4, *mancipium effecta*). Her napping dream, in which a bandit[7] murders her groom with a missile, drives her to hopes of sui-

zosa (1989), Finucane (1996). Lateiner (2000) discusses Apuleius' presentation of marriage.

[4] Junghanns' useful term ([1932] 156-65) for the stories of Charite, Psyche, and Plotina. Anderson (1909) 538 regards the Charite story as an "entirely separate whole" and explores its folktale analogues.

[5] E.g., Char. 1.11, 2.11; Xen. 3.5, 4.5; Ach. Tatius 6.22, cf. 5.20; Longus 4.40; Hld. 4.18, 6.8-9, 7.25, 10.22 et passim. Cf. Konstan (1994) 45-99.

[6] Various words indicate their superior status, including "top-rank, first": *summatem, principalis* (4.23, 26).

[7] Thrasyllus is another robber, the robber-murderer of Charite's first dream and last speech (cf. 4.27, 8.1 and 8.13; Frangoulidis [1993]). He steals Charite's spouse

cide, although the bandits' house-keeper denies significance to day-dreams. This old woman explains 'rational' night-dream interpretation by opposites (4.27: *nocturnae visiones contrarios eventus nonnumquam pronuntiant*), then narrates the diverting 'Cupid and Psyche' fabula. Escape soon follows, the *false* self-liberation and salvation of donkey Lucius and Charite. After the captives depart the cave with inappropriate self-congratulation (6.27-32), the returning robbers catch them in the act.

The intended groom, Tlepolemus/Haemus, eventually extracts the hostage. He enters the robbers' cave in disguise, then outwits and ties up his beloved's abductors (7.4-10, 12). This real—if short-lived—liberation and salvation by Odyssean cleverness (*astu*; cf. Charite at 8.9, 14)[8] provides a spectacle to remember, *memorandum spectamen*, a virgin's triumphal parading and the confirming marital escort, *deductio ad domum*. The whole city is happy (7.13), and Lucius briefly is too. After the summary self-help execution of the bandits, the couple complete their interrupted wedding (cf. Frangoulidis [1992b], [2000]; *repetitam lege tradidere*). The narrator mentions their first sexual intimacies, and Lucius is sent to stud as reward (7.14), but sexual and other earthly joys are short-lived (cf. 7.15-28).

After Lucius tells his disasters at the hands of the sadistic stable-boy, the servile messenger of Charite's catastrophe reports her brief happiness in maturing love (8.2: *gliscentis affectionis firmissimum vinculum*, cf. 4.26). Many of Apuleius' moments of (false) security are ephemeral; this one barely precedes Tlepolemus' murder (8.1 *casu gravissimo*).[9] He reappears as a spectral spouse, one of several mates who return to their survivors.

---

from her by means of a pointed missile and tries to steal her from him. Her dream is partly right and partly wrong, like many of Lucius' perceptions.

[8] The ignorant ass Lucius vilifies all women (7.10-12) much in the mode of the adultery mime and Petronius' Eumolpus. His asinine mind wonders whether she forgets her marriage, ceremony, *nuptiae*, her "fresh husband," *recens maritus*, and her parents' wishes. He wonders whether she likes to play the whore (*scortari libet)* and such games (*ludis*). Then he discovers that Charite is aware of Haemus' true identity.

[9] The Groningen commentators in *GCA* (1985) 4-6 entertain the possibility that Thrasyllus is innocent, Charite deceived by "a figment of [her] (subconscious) imagination." Their arguments seem to me logically possible for a detective story but misguided for the tale's function in Lucius' 'education.'

Living Or Dead Spouses

Was Apuleius interested in the supernatural, magic and witchcraft? This question has an obvious positive answer. His own report of his life in his *Apologia pro se de magia*, his *Doppelgänger* character Lucius in the *Metamorphoses*, and the frequency of sorcerers and magical events there (including those suggested by his title) ensure that the author and his audience were receptive to tales of the supernatural.

A question not yet adequately posed,[10] however, is this: is Apuleius' character Charite interested in non-natural events? When abducted, she thought of mythic Laodameia, a parallel newlywed whose husband rose to re-appear from the dead. The dream that she soon experiences in the (Platonic?) cave seems prophetic to her, and the crone-guard agrees that some dreams are prophetic. When escaping the bandits the first time, sighing Charite talks aloud to the beast with respect (6.28) and repeatedly (6.29, *identidem*). She wonders aloud whether the Ass might not be a man or a god transformed. This unexpected and naïve interest in transformations recalls Lucius' stumbling around Thessalian Hypata hoping or imagining that every rock, bird, tree, body of water, and animal was once morphed from human shape (2.1-2).

She never objects, or otherwise reacts, to the crone's tale of Psyche (although Lucius [6.25] does), in which a newlywed (more or less) husband magically appears and disappears. Newly married couples need special evil-averting protection. Several popular myths, references in Attic comedies, and excavated amulets and a lead tablet employ the magical Ephesian *grammata*.[11] Later, her murdered husband Tlepolemus appears as a ghost in a dream in order to warn her not to touch, much less marry, his killer and to tell her the nasty tale of his treacherous, violent death. After Tlepolemus' spectre appears in her sleep, she threatens her sexually urgent suitor Thrasyllus with her husband's newly dead, avenging spirits (8.9: *manes acerbos mariti*). His spectral re-appearance might have been encouraged and

---

[10] Hijmans (1986) 354 n.6 rather quickly rejects magical associations for the *imagines*.

[11] See Kotansky (1991) 111-12, 121-2, 126, for brief discussion and further bibliography. Menander's apotropaic Ephesian spells protect those marrying by words and a walked encirclement (*Ephesia alexipharmaka,* F 313 Koerte, from the *Suda*).

evoked both by his widow's natural expressions of grief and by her unnatural actions. I refer to the following events.

Soon after Tlepolemus' death, the widow has statues made with his likeness. She worships these *imagines* with 'religious' rituals[12] and obsesses over them.[13] I suggest that this procedure may refer to necromancy, bringing the dead back to the earth's crust. Relevant here are the historical Romano-African accusations brought against Apuleius. The prosecution stated that he had procured for himself a statuette (*simulacrum, sigillum*) of Mercury, god of magic (and thieves), in the form of a skeleton, which he worshipped and called king, *basileus* (*de mag.* 61-5).[14] The prosecution alleged that such an object would have a magical, that is, illicit, purpose. Apuleius' own published speech includes a solemn curse against his opponent Aemilianus's life, invoking three classes of demons – *lemures, manes,* and *larbae*.

Apuleius' internal, illiterate, and far-from-omniscient narrator never suggests that Charite was *trying* to communicate through images with the spirit of Tlepolemus. He is still *ateknos*, childless, a qualification for accessibility of the untimely dead's souls, even if he is no longer *agamos*, unmarried.[15] Apuleius' own past life makes plausible that he would entertain the idea of communing with the spirits, as do the attempts of others to reach the restless dead and recalcitrant spirits for earthly purposes.[16]

Some of Apuleius' literary predecessors have wives and widows try to communicate with supernatural spouses by means of images to permit or compel their beloveds to return. Laodameia caressed a statue of her dead husband Protesilaus. Euripides has dying Alcestis' husband Admetus allege that he will sleep with her material image

[12] The motif of her 'corrupted sacrifice' is relevant here: the dedication of Thrasyllus' eyes to the sacred spirits, *sanctis manibus* of Tlepolemus, and the libation of Thrasyllus' eye-gore (8.12).

[13] Charite later is said to prophesy (8.13). She calls on her husband's name in her daydream. Van der Paardt (1980) 23 states that "to invoke," *invocare,* elsewhere in the *Metamorphoses* always has divine objects.

[14] The other charges include fish practices, dealing with epileptics, a special linen liturgical cloth, nocturnal smoke and feather rituals; see *de mag.* 25-65. Cf. Hunink (1997) *ad loc.*

[15] Tertullian discusses (*de anima* 56-7, ed. Waszink) potential obstacles to the soul's departure from earth and survivors' grief. See Waszink's edition (1947) and Waszink (1954) 391-2 for a summary of categories.

[16] Philosophical Cicero built a shrine for Tullia, dead at 35 without surviving children; *ad Att*. 12.18.1, 21.2.

and hope for visions of her in his sleep (*Alc*. 348-56). Vergil's Dido constructs a chapel to her dead husband Sychaeus before she burns an effigy, an image of her beloved Aeneas (whom she considers her *de facto* husband). We observe a compelling, mixed erotic-destructive ritual (*Aen*. 4.457-9, 508, 640-55): either he should be forced to return to her or he should go to perdition. Her omens will pursue him (661).

Horace's Priapus tells a comic tale that mixes erotic and necromantic ritual. A woolen doll commands a wax doll that must bow to it and suffers melting (*Sat*. 1.8). Ovid's Alcyone prays so hard to Juno for Ceyx' safe return that Juno dispatches Iris, then Morpheus to appear to her in the dripping image of her drowned, dead husband. He tells her that he is dead and will not return. Pygmalion brings his beloved ivory statue of a wife to life with worship, a prayer, and Venus' help (*Metam*. 11.583-709, 10.250-95). After Apuleius, and evoking a different male relation, Heliodorus' witch of Bessa, with a doughy image, summons her son to return to the living in order to learn what happened to her other son (*Aeth*. 6.14-15).[17] The barely heard voices of disempowered ancient women and men turned to necromancy and binding spells, in literature as well as life, when reality offered only the unbearable pain of absence.

Furthermore, returns of dead spouses,[18] re-embodied revenants or spectral apparitions, constitute a *topos* in Classical literature (*GCA* [1985] 89-90). They appear frequently in two genres on which Apuleius continually trenches: epic and Attic tragedy. Epic offers decisive spectral personations on earth: Homer's Patroklos in the *Il-*

---

[17] Lucan's Thessalian necromantic superwitch Erictho (*BC* 6.507-830) focuses on more political issues, although there is reference to snatching the vitals from beloved kinsmen.

[18] The elements that actually return to earth's crust vary. They may include a resurrected body with blood, bones, and soul (Eurydice) or a reanimated corpse (the Witch of Bessa's son in Heliodoros, *Aeth*. 6.14-15) or an unembraceable 'bodiless body' or ghost or double (Morpheus in Ovid, *Metam*. 11.635-83), or a generic vision. The being may return to a waking or sleeping percipient. The dead or undead phantom may be summoned by supplication, compelled by necromantic means, or appear as a 'volunteer' to warn ('grateful dead' crisis apparitions; cf. Felton [1999]) or to haunt (requesting burials, often). Sometimes they return on a contract (Protesilaus, Sisyphus), and sometimes their feared return is ritually prevented (*maschalismos* in, e.g., Aesch. *Choeph*. 439 ff., or Soph. *Electra* 444 ff.). Cf. Kittredge (1885), Vermeule (1979) 236 n.30, and Johnston (1999).

iad, Vergil's Sychaeus, Creusa, and Hector in the *Aeneid,*[19] and Ovid's Ceyx, and also Eurydice, in the *Metamorphoses*. Tragedy offered Apuleius a smorgasbord of spectres, *at least* Phrynichus' lost *Alcestis* (F3 Snell), Aeschylus' Darius and Clytemnestra (*Persians, Eumenides*; cf. *Psychagogoi,* F 273a Radt), all three tragedians' lost versions of *Sisyphus*, and Euripides' invaluable *Alcestis*. Recall that Thessalian Alcestis' niece Laodameia quickly lost and deeply lamented her departed husband, in Euripides' lost *Protesilaus*.[20]

The Protesilaus parallel provides the mythic key to, yet only a fraction of the intertextual enrichment of, Charite's self-image and forecasts certain weighty elements in her tale. Charite herself privileges the analogy saying, "Thus our wedding was annulled and broken up, like that of Attis or Protesilaus" (4.26: *sic ad instar Attidis vel Protesilai dispectae disturbataeque nuptiae*). *She* has her and Laodameia's spoiled weddings in mind, but for *us* the name of Protesilaus recalls foremost his spectral return. The mythical devoted lover, after leaving home and his wedding, attempts to avenge the Trojan outlanders' rape of a Greek woman, but falls in battle. He returns from the dead to his spouse. These recombinant motifs surface below.

Apuleius' novel includes several other notable returns of the dead: Socrates' and Thelyphron's corpses are briefly reanimated, the former by chortling witches, the latter's restless corpse by another kind of otherworld professional, the Isiac mage Zatchlas (1.17-19; 2.28-30). This latter case resembles Tlepolemus', in that an adultery and murder require the dead sexual partner to indict the living perpetrator.

Violent killing produces talkative and harmful or helpful phantoms. The violently dead are very active.[21] A surprising number of spirits enjoy an "escape clause" (Vermeule [1979] 7 and 211 n.1) that permits a return in the course of which spirits wear their old bodies, often with last-visible clothes and wounds. Like cryptic

---

19 Dreamy Dido has sleep-visions of the live Aeneas as well as of the dead Sychaeus: the former nightmare hounds her and leaves her abandoned (*Aen*. 4.465-8).

20 See Anderson (1909) 547 following Maass (1886/7 [*non vidi*]), Hijmans (1986), and Gantz (1993) 592-3. Johnston (1999) discusses early Greek ghosts, and Stramaglia (1999) pursues the Roman material. Other ancient examples of revenant intimates extend from Enkidu in the Sumerian and Akkadian *Gilgamesh* (contested Tablet XII) to Andromache in Seneca's *Trojan Women* and beyond.

21 The 'dead to the world' (as human) Lucius, in ass-form, helpfully reveals Philesitherus to the miller by stepping on the young adulterous man's fingers (9.27).

dreams, and often in them, the visions can reflect, predict, provoke, warn or threaten. They are not easily managed. The dead Tlepolemus' vengeful visit (8.8) at a moment of crisis has a later parallel in the murdered miller's ghostly visit, probably also in his daughter's dream sleep (9.29-31). The adulterous miller's wife hired a hurtful witch to excite the ghost (*umbra*)[22] of a murdered woman. His humiliated wife summoned the unrelated pale, thin ghost of a murdered woman to persuade her husband to take her back, or failing that, to attack and magically kill the *pistor* (9.29-31). The latter is what she has to do. The second ghost, of the violently killed man, then reveals the ghoulish, malificent machinations of his unfaithful wife (*familiares feminarum artes*) to his only surviving avenger, his distraught, breast-beating daughter.[23] Spousal and paternal ghosts warn and/or avenge crimes against the family. These spectres respond to the live percipients' *and* the dead person's needs. Both the miller and Tlepolemus appear as they died, with a noose around the neck or pale and covered with gore.[24] These two dream-ghosts and the parallel revenant Thelyphron reveal sexual infidelity and murder to the blood-kin.

Most Apuleian spirits of the 'unliving' inform or warn living but clueless relatives of matters otherwise unknowable. All of Apuleius' ghost stories constitute indisputable additions to the earlier extant Lucianic 'Ass Tale,' a further indication of the author's consuming interest in the supernatural (cf. *de Magia*). These friendly yet angry dead include Tlepolemus' gory ghost (*umbra*) and his numerous analogues in early Greek and Latin literature.

Thrasyllus, Charite's former and present insistent suitor, and Tlepolemus' rival for her favors, has murdered the young hero without witnesses and by foul play. His spectre (*nocturnis imaginibus*) returns to his beloved widow, recently married, a common folktale

[22] The terminology of ghosts, in Greek, Latin, and English is very various; cf. Felton (1999), Stramaglia (1999). In Charite's story alone, Tlepolemus is a shade, spectre, spirits: *umbra, imagines, manes* (8.8, 9, 14; cf. Charite 7.4). Thrasyllus is a phantom, *simulacrum* (8.12; cf. Socrates 1.6). The bandits speak of fear of spirits and ghosts, *manes larvasque* (6.30; cf. 9.29). Lucius prays to Proserpina who fends off ghost-attacks, *larvales impetus* (11.2). Winkler (1985) 69-73 considers the genre of '*Dead men's tales*.'

[23] Omitting metaphorical resurrections or returns from death such as Lucius after his trial (3.9) or his anamorphosis back to human form (11.13). See my recent (2001) article on immobility in Apuleius.

[24] *Revincta cervice; sanie cruentam et pallore deformem.* Cf. the epic ghosts of Enkidu, Patroklos, Elpenor, Sychaeus, and Hector, which I will treat in a separate study.

element,[25] interrupting Charite's chaste night's sleep (8.8-9: *quietem pudicam, inquieta quieti excussa*).

The mangled and pale *shade* of Charite's spouse visits (8.8) to inform and warn his "eternal spouse" (8.14, *coniunx perpetua*) against her already unwelcome suitor.[26] Tlepolemus penetrates the permeable barrier between living and dead spouses. He does so by means of two of Tertullian's categories of revenant phantoms, the untimely and the violently dead (*aoroi* and *biaiothanatoi,* but not the *ataphoi* or unburied dead; *de anima* 56-7). Charite's first vision, in a daydream, introduces her as confused, passive, garrulous, and suicidal. It is a dream vision, not a spectre. Her last vision, a nightmare with a spectre, fires her up to be determined, active, uncommunicative (8.9, *indicio … dissimulato*), and murderous (Scioli [1999]).[27] Although the story has only one phantom 'actually' appear, others are intimated or even invoked. Charite threatens the impatient Thrasyllus ironically with her husband's bitter spirits who may rise to kill him, if he does not wait until her mourning period has ended (8.9, *manes acerbos*). Finally after blinding and public exposure, the killer gives himself up 'voluntarily' to his victims' hostile spirits, *infesti manes,* as a victim (8.14). Thrasyllus dies by self-starvation (*inedia*). This is the approved form of female spousal suicide and the very one that, ironically, both Petronius' widow of Ephesus and widow Charite had chosen but *not* performed (*Sat*. 111-12, Apul. 8.7).

[25] Cf. Phlegon's Aitolarch or Aetolian governor, Polykritos, married but four nights (*Mirab*. 2.2); transl. Hansen (1996).

[26] Cf. Psyche's eternal nuptials, 6.23. The god Cupid, for analogously monitory and minatory reasons, also returns in another form, a disguise, to his fiancée Psyche in captivity (5.4-6, 22) and again during Psyche's anabasis (6.21). The faithful wife Plotina (7.6) adopts a peculiar trans-sexual disguise in the brigand Haemus' autobiography. Her sartorial deceit—like Haemus' own—is intended to mislead everyone but her husband: a woman of unusual loyalty and unique virtue (*uxor rarae fidei atque singularis pudicitiae*). She never leaves her spouse. Haemus, the novel's most heroic spouse-in-disguise, narrates this story of marital fidelity that has two meanings for two audiences – the bandits and his Charite.

[27] She injects Thrasyllus into a neither dead nor living state (*incertum simulacrum*) and a permanent sightless dream (8.12): "Dream happily…and you won't ever see anything except when sleeping" (*beate somniare… nec quicquam videbis nisi dormiens*). On Greek dreams, see Messer (1918), MacAlister (1996).

Literary Antecedents for Apuleius' Spectral Spouse

Whence did Apuleius conjure up these phantoms? Tlepolemus' apparition descends directly from Vergil's wickedly murdered spouse, Sychaeus.[28] Vergil's rendezvous between Aeneas and Creusa, Aeneas and Hector, and Andromache's summoning of Hector's ghost supply further relevant combinations of Latin vocabulary, phantom appearance, and theme (details in *GCA* [1985]; Frangoulidis [1992b]).[29]

Protesilaus, however, provides the oldest, best, and geographically closest parallel to Apuleius' couple's brief enjoyment of marriage, obsessive spousal fidelity, and ghoulish re-appearance. Homer's catalogue of ships tells us much briefly about the first Achaean to land at Troy. His *domos* (home and/or marriage) in Phylake was half-built, and his anxious wife, after begging him not to go, tore her cheeks in grief – like Charite (*Il.* 2. 698-702). Phylake is probably to be located in Southeastern Thessaly (cf. Strabo 9.435), in Charite's vicinity. The marriage was but one day old (Schol. Eurip. p. 563, Nauck *TGF*[2]), when Protesilaus left for war. He died, first of the Achaeans, soon after landing. Laodameia grieves (also Prop. 1.19, Ovid. *Her.* 13). Laodameia has a statue made of her dead mate to which she offers sacrifice.[30] She desires him and "associates with" it,

[28] *Aen.* 1.335-64, Forbes (1943); Frangoulidis (1992b), esp. 438-44, (1996), (1999); Finkelpearl (1998) ch.6.

[29] Thematic parallels between Charite and Dido extend far beyond verbal echoes. Recall the early sexual contacts (in their Thessalian and African caves), the brief periods of bliss and premature separation due to a third party, the warning visions of the dead male spouses (Sychaeus and Tlepolemus), the delirious and frenzied rushing about, and the suicide by sword of the surviving widow seeking eternal conjugal union with the deceased (8.14: *marito perpetuam coniugem*; cf. Lazzarini [1986] 140-4). The sword for suicide is the beloved's weapon, although for Charite this means her husband's, while for Dido, her disappearing lover's (Frangoulidis [1992b] 438 ff.; [2000] 615 n.32). The bandits wield swords and daggers, the hunters, spears; the boar, his tusks; and Charite, her hairpin (the gendered weapon par excellence; cf. brooches in Hdt. 5.87) and (once, emphatic inversion) Tlepolemus' sword. Thrasyllus' own shameful death, in contrast, is bloodless and like a woman's immolation or immuration. Apuleius' fictions insistently borrow elements and unexpectedly recombine them for learned readers' puzzled pleasure.

[30] Charite's agalmatophilia (8.7) recalls, most indubitably because of the rarity of the doll-substitute motif, Euripides' Admetus and Ovid's Pygmalion (*Alk.* 348-56; *Metam.* 10.246-69). Dido's marble chapel for her dead spouse whom she honored magnificently (*miro… honore colebat*) is the dominant recent antecedent. Cf. Charite: "by a self-imposed slavery, she worshipped with divine services the images

fondles it obsessively, perhaps "has [sexual] intercourse" with it.[31] The dead spirit eventually is granted a one-day, perhaps only three-hour, pass by the gods below to his wife above, because the gods pity the young widow (Hyg. *Fab.* 103-4). When Laodameia realizes that the Protesilaus who has returned is only a phantom, she commits suicide. Laodameia and Charite rush through town in order to commit suicide at their husband's final earthly location.[32] Lovelorn Laodameia sets the pattern for the desperate spouse (usually female) bereaved by the mate's early death. She compensates for the absence by creating a (sometimes specifically) cultic image, a portrait, and/or experiencing a phantom and/or dream of the deceased.[33] The specifically Bacchic images of Charite (8.7: *imagines defuncti quas ad habitum dei Liberi formaverat*: "idols of the dead man that she had fashioned after the characteristic appearance of Liber the god") may derive from Dionysiac myths and rituals of rebirth. They signify the survivor's hope for return from the dead, rebirth following the pattern of Jupiter's statue or *imago* of Dionysus created after his son's murder by the Titans.[34] The still image, like the labile phantom or dream, mediates for the widow(er) between life and death,[35] between the 'here' and the 'not here' of the absent spouse. The survivor's 'contact' with the images, material or immaterial (Laodameia, Admetus, Charite, perhaps Dido) provides painful consolation (*solacio cruciabat*).

The reference to Laodameia, the mythic paradigm of brief marriage,[36] characterizing the very beginning of Charite's story of be-

of her deceased husband" (*imagines defuncti… affixo servitio divinis percolens honoribus*); Hijmans (1986).

[31] So Michael Simpson's (1976) translation, p. 243 of Apoll. *Epit.* 3.29-30: *prosomilese*; Hyg. *Fab.* 103-4.

[32] For Laodameia, Protesilaus' pyre (Hyg. *Fab.* 104); for Charite, Tlepolemus' tomb and coffin (8.13): *monimentum mariti, capulum.*

[33] Bettini (1999) 9-14, 18-34 explores images of deceased spouses, citing *inter alia*, the fragmentary tale of Laodameia, Euripides *Alc.* 328 ff., Ovid *Her.* 13.105-9, Stat. *Silv.* 2.7.120 ff., and Apuleius. He also notes the parallel epigraphic evidence of Allia Potestas and Cornelia Galla (*CIL* 6.3795, 8. 434; cf. Lattimore [1935/1962] 100-3, 275-80) on deification of the deceased and on praise of spouses. I thank David Konstan for this reference mentioned at the delightful meetings of ICAN 2000 in Groningen.

[34] Hijmans (1986); Bettini (1999) 34, citing Firmicus Maternus *de err. prof.* 6.1 ff.

[35] Bettini (1999) 34 describes the image as filling "a gap of expectation."

[36] Davies (1985) 632-6, in a discussion of the handshake motif on Roman sarcophagi (and other visual representations), notes examples of Protesilaus' brief re-

reavement, accurately foretells the fate of the newlyweds but with *characteristically* misleading clues.[37] The nocturnal reunion of spectral Tlepolemus and *infelix* Charite recalls yet other important storybook marriages and chaste women, notably Livy's Lucretia and Plutarch's husband-loving, "*philandros*" Kamma. The Roman kills herself after exposing her violator; the Galatian poisons (*n.b.*) her husband's killer and her intended seducer Sinorix (and herself) sooner than yield her concupiscible body.[38] Charite's worship of her dead spouse and literally suicidal dedication (8.6) *parallels* lovers in other texts that evoke the clichés of univiral devotion and *Liebestod*. The least noticed Laodameia-like subtext (because usually misunderstood) is Ceyx's obsessive spouse Alcyone in Ovid's homonymous *Metamorphoses*.[39] All three women experience brief, interrupted marital bliss and all three bewail their situations when death separates them from husbands. Again, all three 'once-married' *univirae* are granted visions of the untimely and violently dead spouse.

Apuleius also, however, *parodies* sentimental obsessions.[40] His heroine melodramatically grieves and his bumpkin narrator (8.1: one of the servants, *unus ex famulis*) displays prosecutorial partiality and literary and rhetorical flourishes.[41] In this too, Apuleius alludes to predecessors and parallels in poetry and prose. Ovid, as I argue elsewhere (see n. 39), burlesques marital anxiety in the extended, novel-

---

turn from the shades to his faithful wife. Here the gesture may represent a Greek, Etruscan, and Roman concept of marital fidelity that extends beyond the grave into the underworld. The Protesilaus paradigm is found precisely in the Antonine age of Apuleius.

[37] Cf. Frangoulidis (1993) 109. Aeneas sights Laodamia herself walking with Dido in the Underworld, both suicidal victims of pitiless love, *durus amor* (*Aen*. 6.442-51). The collocation strengthens both the Vergilian reference and clarifies the meaning of the earlier death of Laodamia.

[38] Livy 1.58; Plut. *Mor*. 257e-58c=*Mul. Virt*. 20; Anderson (1909) 539-41 (following Rohde); Walsh (1970) 53-5.

[39] Otis (1970) 231-66 esp. 262-3, following Hermann Fränkel, incorrectly thought that Alcyone's and Pygmalion's marriages were happy. See my paper in progress on doubling in Ovid's 'Ceyx and Alcyone.'

[40] Winkler (1985) 45, 156 recognizes parodic elements in this story, but *GCA* (1985) 7 rejects the idea. Winkler (pp. 157-9) discusses the pretensions implied by references to books.

[41] E.g., the exordial 8.1: *equisones opilionesque etiam busequae, fuit Charite nobisque misella … manes adivit…. quaeque possint merito doctiores, quibus stilos Fortuna sumministrat, in historiae specimen chartis involvere,* or "Stablemen, shepherds, and cowherds too, Charite is no longer. She has left us… for the shades…. [I shall tell you all,] a story which more educated men, whom Fortune has educated to write, may justly include in their books as a historical model of repute" (cf. 1.23).

like Ceyx and Alcyone story. Petronius in Eumolpus' inserted 'Milesian' tale of the 'widow of Ephesus' mocks the very concept of sexual dependability. His sardonic allusion inverts the romantic paradigm, as he mocks an inhuman level of female fidelity (*Sat.* 111-12). The faithful Ephesian wife, another weeper, hair-tearer, and breast-beater (signature gestures of grief), appears as barely alive, but is seduced from her determination to die from grief and starvation (*inedia,* another parallel to Charite) in her spouse's grave and tomb. She then 'rationally' decides to sacrifice her husband's otherwise useless corpse to the cross that held a common thief. She does so to save her living soldier-lover, the corpses' body-guard, from his own suicide or similar execution as an imposed penalty. Apuleius alludes to this essential novelistic predecessor more than once: for example, when describing Charite's unwavering death-seeking devotion or the language of her crucifying solace: Charite *ipso se solacio cruciabat* (8.4; cf. Ciaffi [1960], Finkelpearl [1998] 145). We naturally expect a similar failure of devotion, but…

Charite's Many Liaisons

Although one romantic interpretation[42] focuses on the "eternal wife," the *perpetuam coniugem,* with her 'love stronger than death,' the revenant 'bodiless bodies' promise no further happiness. The ghosts visiting earth wish merely that their survivors take appropriate vengeance. Charite's extended, inserted tale piles union on union, wedding on wedding. First her conventional marriage ritual is interrupted. The Thessalian bandits' pseudo-marital escort, *deductio,* replaces Haemus' legitimate one. The thieves become her *de facto* household or *domus* and exhibit thoughtful solicitude for her body and spirit (4.23-4). They express no lust, because her chaste virtue, *pudicitia,* constitutes her value for both her parents and their hopes for ransom. Haemus' later suggestion to sell their virgin to a brothel for greater profit makes this clear (7.9: *nec ... levi pretio, magnis talentis*). For the nonce, however, she is their woman.

[42] *Aen.* 1.343-60 [Sychaeus], 6.472-4; Ovid's Orpheus, *Metam.* 11.60-6; Apuleius' Charite and the sub-narrator, *Metamorphoses* 8.13-14. Lucian's *Philopseudes* spoofs lovers' credulity. A grieving widower describes his dead Demainete who returns for a forgotten, unfound and unburied, gilt slipper (*Philops.* 27).

In the first escape, Ass-Lucius and Charite 'elope.' They steal away from those with authority over her in a parody of agreed-upon abduction (as in Heliodorus' story of Charicleia [4.12-5.1]; Lateiner [1997/2000]). Lucius has earlier expressed sexual interest in her: "a girl, by god, worthy of even such an ass's desire" (4.23: *puellam mehercules et asino tali concupiscendam*), and her present language is full of flirtatious elements.[43] He sees himself as a new Perseus, the virgin's liberator (*liberandae virginis studio*); he tries to chat her up and kisses her feet (*delicatas voculas adhinnire; pedes decoros puellae basiabam*). She calls him the "guardian of my freedom," *praesidium meae libertatis* and "my savior," *meum sospitatorem*. She promises him grooming and bathing services, dainty foods, and golden gifts (his career as stud?). Best of all, she foretells dignity and mythic status for the lowly, beaten ass. With many sighs, she compares the trip of the two of them to the plainly sexual ride of Bull/Jupiter and Europa. She wonders whether beneath the ass lurks a man or god (*vultus hominis vel facies deorum*). In brief, the escape is sexualized by both parties and likened to a nother bestial union.

The amused bandits rudely interrupt the escapees' parallel fantasies. Charite's third union collapses, but Haemus soon successfully plots yet another abduction, from Charite's captors. The engaged couple returns to town and completes the approved aristocratic form of legal wedding (8.2: *in boni Tlepolemi manum venerat*). Thrasyllus, the noble and generous but whoring, wicked, and therefore rejected suitor (*procos..., eximiisque muneribus…morum tamen improbatus repulsae contumelia fuerat aspersus*),[44] subsequently hopes she will commit adultery (*adulterinae Veneris*), but, failing that, he murders the groom to approach the lovely bride (*nupta*).

The faithful young widow Charite wants to end her life to fulfill her univiral bridal vow, first when she tries to kill herself at once (8.6: *paenissime ibidem quam devoverat, ei reddidit animam*), then, after the funeral, by starvation and dark isolation like unto death (*tenebris imis abscondita*). She lives, barely, in desire and worships statues of her defunct husband, like Laodameia, simulating piety to

[43] 6.27: amorous murmurings, *gannitibus*; cf. 10.22, the seductive words of the rich lady with whom he does pleasurably couple.

[44] Apuleius surely invented Thrasyllus (Van der Paardt [1980] 21), precisely to introduce the spectre.

the god (?) while kissing the image of her beloved (*luctuoso desiderio, imagines defuncti*; Hyg. 104; cf. Ovid, *Her*. 13.151-8).[45]

Thrasyllus eagerly touches the beautiful widow (*studium contrectandae*) in the pretense of consoling her. After the funeral, he pressures her, her friends, and her family to encourage her to rejoin the world, to bathe and eat (8.7). And so, after Tlepolemus' 'accidental death,' while Charite remains immersed in grief, Thrasyllus imprudently proposes that she marry him (*de nuptiis convenire*). She collapses in shock, then requests deferral. Tlepolemus' spectre, *umbra,* appears to her, calls her his *coniunx* and his alone, but he/it allows her to marry again – anyone but his polluted murderer Thrasyllus. She should not touch his hand, speak to him, eat with him. He climaxes these prohibitions with "nor sleep in his bed."[46] Thrasyllus insistently returns with further marriage talk (*de nuptiis*). Charite, now dissimulating her loathing, demands a year of mourning to forfend an untimely wedding, *immaturitas nuptiarum*, and invokes a serious threat: dead Tlepolemus' spirits (*manes acerbi*) may attack overly rash Thrasyllus.

Thrasyllus, however, continues his wicked whispers until Charite pretends to accede to clandestine coitus (8.10: also *furtivus concubitus*). The 'marriage' is to be secret[47] and lethal (8.11: *scaena feralium nuptiarum*; cf. 4.26, 6.27, 8.8 bis). He is to come "without a mate," *viduatus*.[48] She addresses him, after his pseudo-wedding feast has begun, now helpless in his induced, drugged, and vinous stupor as "dear husband" (*en carus maritus*). Charite's furious vengeance-plot frightfully simulates Thrasyllus' intended nuptials-plot (8.11).

She soliloquizes that he will not further possess Charite or enjoy marriage (*nuptias non frueris*), or dream of her dire caresses (*pestiferos amplexus*). She closes with sarcastic mention of wedding torches and chamber (*sic faces nuptiales tuos illuminarunt*

---

[45] Apuleius' debt to Ovid's Laodameia includes her general anxiety (2-9) for Protesilaus' safety, her fainting (23-4), parental inadequacy (25-7), Bacchic frenzy (33-4), tears (52), dreams of a pale ghost (!107-9: *pallens imago*), and religious worship combined with sexual affection for the effigy (153-6).

[46] 8.8: *nec toro acquiescas,* a synecdoche for marriage, as also "into Thrasyllus' hand," *in Thrasylli manum.*

[47] Just as she kept a secret with Tlepolemus in the cave, she develops a secret death plan for Thrasyllus involving secret sexual intercourse. He must keep the secret, as she has, and as Psyche has already and Lucius will do in the future.

[48] An ironic touch (8.10), applied earlier to Tlepolemus (4.27) and to Psyche (4.32, *virgo vidua,* 5.5).

thalamos), bridesmaids and groomsman (*pronubas et...comitem*). She stabs out his eyes[49] with a hairpin, a female equivalent of Thrasyllus' murderous spear and the boar's murderous tusks. The 'poetic justice' of the punishment avenges Thrasyllus' crimes against the lawful marriage of Tlepolemus and Charite (Frangoulidis [2000] 614). Charite speaks to the audience gathered from town about her husband and Thrasyllus, the thief of her marriage (*mariti, nuptiarum praedonem*). Despite community efforts to prevent her suicide, she stabs herself with a sword below the breast hoping to return to her husband. She is buried with him to be his entombed spouse forever (8.14: *unita sepultura ibidem marito perpetuam coniugem*).[50] This final violent bodily penetration is the last in a story that exhibits many of them.

Charite has thus entertained thoughts and rituals of sexual union or marriage with six partners or pursuers, whether or not consummated. These six are: Tlepolemus her fiancé, the robbers, Lucius the Ass, Tlepolemus again as her husband in life, Thrasyllus, and Tlepolemus finally as spouse in the other world. She misses her first wedding, suffers the second house-sharing, enjoys the third and fourth, plans the fifth with clever malice (with an inversion of male/female, violator/victim roles),[51] and executes the sixth (in both

---

[49] The tragic *peripeteia* (blinding, a symbolic castration; cf. Van der Paardt [1980] 24, Frangoulidis [2000] 612) and the explanatory tragic soliloquy plainly recall Sophocles' *Oedipus Rex*. By appearing brotherly (8.7: *fratrem*; cf. Charite's comment in 8.9) and then desiring crazy sex with his brother's wife (*furiosa libido*), Thrasyllus earns his Oedipal punishment stalling him between life and death. Tlepolemus calls him a parricide, an appropriate term for the incestuous crime (cf. *OLD: parricidium* 2, p. 1299.). Like Oedipus, he must be led blind by the hand to the place of his voluntary disappearance from the land of the living (8.14). Like Oedipus, Thrasyllus brashly thinks he can manage human affairs to his liking.

[50] Having gained revenge on Thrasyllus, her death is brief and simple. She plunges her deceased husband's sword into her chest, falls in her own blood, and dies en route to her only love (8.13-14).

[51] Charite inverts Thrasyllus' murder of her husband by her blinding him (social death), as she inverts his trap of her husband by her trap (sex as hunt). The plot repeatedly re-enacts the Odyssean triad of disguise, debilitation, and humiliating damage in vengeance. First, Tlepolemus as Haemus deceives the kidnapping bandits. Second, Thrasyllus deceives Tlepolemus. Third, Charite deceives Thrasyllus. Frangoulidis has teased out echoes of Roman marriage imagery in several articles: (1992b), (1996), (2000). The violator becomes victim, the penetrator becomes penetrated. Another example of poetic justice: Thrasyllus' helpless position, flat on his back – like Tlepolemus just before his death: 8.5, 11: *supinatus, supinato;* cf. the two reff. to disabled tortoises: Aristomenes and Philesitherus: 1.12, 9.27. Inversions include men behaving like women (7.8, 8.5, 8.11; also the manner of Thrasyllus' swordless, unmanly death: 8.12, 14), women behaving like men (6.27, 7.7, 8.11:

senses of the word). Twice disrupted, the novel's 'happiest mortal marriage' finds fulfillment only in her and the subnarrator's romantic ideas of permanent reunion in death.

Charite's life is full of interruptions, grief, false salvations, and self-abuse. She weeps and tears her hair and clothes when first abducted and brought to the cave (4.23), after the bandits and hag console her, and after nodding off and dreaming of her fiancé's death (4.24-5). She laughs with joy (her only laugh) when Haemus contrives her phony brothel-punishment (7.10), but then, after joyous marriage, the unhappy bride, *infelix nupta,* soon loses her husband forever. "Out of her mind, driven to madness, in a deranged running frenzy…with a crazed cry" (*amens et vecordia percita, cursuque bacchata furibundo…insana voce*), she grieves greatly, like other brides widowed early. But, like Laodameia and Alcyone, she endlessly pursues her intense mourning, beating her breasts, starving herself, and ripping at clothes and hair (8.7-8: *inedia, incuria squalida, luctuoso desiderio, se solacio cruciabat*). After Thrasyllus' plan and past are clarified by his admissions and Tlepolemus' phantom, she wails, tears her clothing, and beats at her arms even more (8.9).

Conclusions

Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* elsewhere consistently figures marriage negatively – as a trap, a deceit, or a source of misery. The same is true of his most immediate models, Ovid and Petronius. Lucius scorns the cold and adulterous marriage of Milo and Pamphile (2.11). His lusty dalliance with Photis never imagines marriage (2.17). Thelyphron's beautiful and savage wife is a poisoner, adulteress, and thief (2.27). The merciless child-killing and greedy Murderess of Five (10.23-8) discourages matrimonial thoughts. The better characters, even those with children, e.g., the farmer who loses three sons

---

masculis animis, 13: Charite's holding off the multitude with a sword, also "grief foreign to my manly courage," *luctum meis virtutibus alienum;* 14: "manly spirit," *animam virilem*), hunters becoming the defenceless hunted: unconscious Thrasyllus (8.5, 11-13 – "see the mighty hunter," *en venator egregius*), embracing of the enemy (8.6), Charite's death to be like sleep and her sleep like death (8.7), the living behaving like the dead (8.6, 7; 8.11-12 [*sepelivit*]; cf. 7.12 robbers [*sepultis*], 8.14), and the dead behaving like the living (8.8).

(9.33-8), do not visibly enjoy happy marriages. The only positive presentations are allegorical or divine: Cupid and Psyche and Lucius' monogamous, sex-negative dedication to Isis ([11.16, 25]; Lateiner [2000]). Charite's "true story," *specimen historiae* (8.1), embodies another, sweeter paradigm, before the *Liebespaar*'s (unparalleled and brief) marital bliss implodes.

The equivalent romance embedded in the Lucianic *Onos* includes the robbers' capture, the woman's brief escape and recapture, and the rescue by her fiancé, but none of Apuleius' subsequent Thrasyllus story, especially the significant spectre. The Lucianic messenger reports the couple's death as they walk the shore and are (inorganically)[52] swept off by a tidal wave from nowhere (34). Apuleius certainly created the Thrasyllus panel of the story, Thrasyllus' murder, Tlepolemus' ghost-dream, and Charite's vendetta. How does the later part of the tale affect his novel?

Apuleius' uniquely parceled out Charite-story[53] of marital catastrophe frames his more famous Psyche story, described as an old wives' tale and providing a spiritual allegory with happy ending (for another early departed husband). The Charite-frame forces us to question the meaning and relevance of the inset Psyche-canvas. The spectral spouse Tlepolemus bittersweetly figures earthly love's ephemerality and romantically implies love's durability beyond death itself. Apuleius also parodies clichés of blessed nuptials found in other romances and old wives' tales, like the 'Cupid and Psyche.' He re-enforces his grim view of ordinary terrestrial pleasures and institutions, even for people more innocent than his anti-hero Lucius.

Lucius again repeats the Apuleian master-pattern of 1] victim, 2] victor, and 3] victim again. Here we observe: 1] captive burden-carrier; 2] free (ass-) suitor of the maid decorated with jewelry, med-

[52] Fortuna, Apuleius' convenient, analogous *dea ex machina*, barely surfaces in Charite's romance, unlike in Psyche's or Lucius'. She is described as blind, more often as perverse or malignant, sometimes kind and/or just. Sometimes she seems to be only a useful device for transitions, another word for plot or a vaguely fated future.

[53] Four main panels: Charite's capture (4.23-7) the end of book 4's forward action; the unsuccessful escape (6.27-32), the end of book 6; Haemus' liberation of the captives (7.1-14), the beginning of book 7; and Apuleius' original contribution, the marriage's disaster (8.1-14), the beginning of book 8.

als and delicacies (*monilibus, bullis, edulia*);[54] and 3] recaptured beast of burden subject to a criminal mob's revenge and death with torture (6.31). This frequent change of roles, another limited and social kind of metamorphosis, parallels Charite's *peripeteias,* both when the ungainly two are together and when apart. Lucius, so often wrong, is *right* about the danger of meeting the bandits at the intersection (6.29), but Charite fails to understand and over-rules him. This parallels Charite's urgent and salutary advice to Tlepolemus not to go hunting for dangerous wild animals (*bestias armatas dente vel cornu*). She is likewise shunted aside as a "gutless woman" (8.4, 5: *in modum pavoris feminei deiecti,* Thrasyllus says ironically).

Humans are *usually* wrong, but Apuleius suggests that being entirely right is not enough. This life is not fair. Humanity is subject to divine whim and human magic. Rational efforts to forfend harm and momentary successes both lead to further disaster as one advances from the frying pan to the fire, from 'bad to worse.' Cupid and Isis 'save' Psyche and Lucius, not because they deserve alleviation, but despite their depravity. Charite is a victim of her own beauty and men's "insane passion," *furiosa libido* (8.3), greed, and cruelty (6.30-2, 7.9).

Two aspects of the Charite-story thus illuminate the novel. First, many spoiled marriages in Apuleius evoke a departed spirit: Socrates, Thelyphron, Psyche (at Cupid's palace, and in Hades), and the miller, as well as Tlepolemus. Second, the return of the just married Protesilaus' spirit to his widow is the most relevant and popular analogue for understanding, or being invited to misunderstand and misinterpret, the short trajectory of Charite's "unspeakable specimen of history" (8.1) – ephemeral bliss. Apuleius belonged to an age that believed that ghosts are real and difficult to control. So too is his slippery, evasive novel.

Charite and Tlepolemus' unideal romance speeds through an accelerated coupling and deadly decoupling in twenty-seven chapters divided unevenly into three acts (the fourth act has no Tlepolemus at all). The acts are far removed from each other. Greek novel motifs are often turned upside-down. 1] Childhood bed-mates, consenting parents, marriage festivities interrupted by bandit abduction (4.26);

---

[54] Charite soon will celebrate the farm-animal by dedicating a votive picture of the escape. The image will produce legendary status and speculations about his perhaps human or divine 'real' status (6.29).

2] then, heroic recovery and happy celebration private and public (7.4-14); 3] finally, after a short interlude of bliss, murder, profound spousal grief, the angry shade, bloody revenge, revelation of secret knowledge, and victim and villain suicide (8.1-14). Many of the motifs here stand opposed to the Greek romances, from the originally agreeable families to the heroic, wily husband, to, unhappily soon after (and not happily ever after), the violent deaths of all – the good, the bad, and the beautiful. The Apuleian inset tale thus provides breakneck anti-romance that once again reveals Apuleius consciously subverting, when not inverting, his Greek 'models'.

EPIC EXTREMITIES: THE OPENINGS AND CLOSURES OF BOOKS IN APULEIUS' *METAMORPHOSES*

Stephen Harrison

Introduction

This paper forms part of a continuing series of studies on epic features in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*.[1] Its particular concern is with the book-openings and book-closures in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* and their intertextual links with the traditional modes of opening and closing of books in ancient epic narratives. Beginnings and endings, much studied by classical scholars in recent years,[2] are emphatically marked parts of literary works and their individual books, and are likely to play a role in the articulation and establishment of generic identity. The openings and closures of books in the *Metamorphoses* both recall epic models and distance themselves from them; here as elsewhere, the *Metamorphoses* presents itself as para-epic, a text which uses many epic patterns and themes but which presents them in a way appropriate for its own, different and less dignified, genre of Roman prose fiction, with its low-life colour and 'Milesian' connections.[3]

As has often been stressed, the epic, with its prime status in ancient education, was a natural and familiar model for the ancient novel as a long fictional text contained in a series of books;[4] in the case of the *Metamorphoses*, as I have argued elsewhere,[5] there is a clear element of the display of 'cultural capital' by the witty use and reprocessing of the acknowledged canonical texts of Greco-Roman

---

1 Cf. Harrison (1990b), (1997), (1998a); for other work looking at this connection cf. e.g. Frangoulidis (1992a), (1992b), (1992c) and Finkelpearl (1990), (1998).

2 Cf. Dunn, Cole (1992) on beginnings; Roberts, Dunn, Fowler (1997) and Fowler (2000) 225-307 on closure.

3 On the Milesian colour of the Roman novels cf. Harrison (1998b).

4 See e.g. the bibliography collected in Harrison (1997).

5 Harrison (2000) 226.

literature, especially Homer, Vergil and Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, aimed at an élite readership which shared the education of the author. Such high-level literary play was particularly suited to the age of the Second Sophistic, the renaissance of Greek culture under the prosperous conditions of Roman rule in the period approximately 50-250 A.D.,[6] when literary learning and display reinforced and supported social standing and prestige in the West as well as the East of the Roman Empire.

Book-Openings and Book-Closures – Linear Analysis

In this main section of this paper, I will look at all the openings and closures of the books of the *Metamorphoses* with this generic aspect firmly in mind.

Book 1. The opening sentences of the *Metamorphoses*, the first part of a much-studied prologue,[7] sends out a complex mixture of generic signals:

> 1.1.1-2 *At ego tibi sermone isto Milesio varias fabulas conseram, auresque tuas benivolas lepido susurro permulceam, modo si papyrum Aegyptiam argutia Nilotici calami inscriptam non spreveris inspicere.*[8] *Figuras fortunasque hominum in alias imagines conversas et in se rursum mutuo nexu refectas, ut mireris, exordior. Quis ille? Paucis accipe.*[9]
>
> But let me join together different stories in that Milesian style, and let me soothe your kindly ears with an agreeable whispering, if only you do not scorn to glance at an Egyptian papyrus inscribed with the sharpness of a reed from the Nile. I begin a tale of men's shapes and fortunes transformed into different appearances and back again into themselves by mutual connection, that you may wonder at it. "Who is this ?" Hear in brief.

As commentators have noted, the abrupt beginning looks back to Platonic-style dialogues which affect to begin as if in the middle of a

[6] For accounts of the Second Sophistic cf. e.g. Anderson (1993), Swain (1996) 1-6, Schmitz (1997).

[7] For my own views see Harrison (1990a), and for a multi-authored collection studying the passage in great detail see Kahane, Laird (2001).

[8] This punctuation placing a full stop after *inspicere* is not that of Robertson (see next note), who simply carries the sentence on, but is common in earlier editions; for arguments for its revival see Harrison (1990a).

[9] The text of the *Metamorphoses* cited in this paper is that of Robertson (1940-45), unless otherwise noted.

conversation: with *at ego* we may compare the opening of Xenophon's *Symposium* (1.1) ἀλλ’ ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ…: "Well, it seems to me…" The iussive first-person subjunctive *conseram* also recalls a non-epic genre, the comic drama of Plautus and Terence – cf. Plautus *Persa* 542-3 *videam modo / mercimonium,* "let me just see the goods," Terence *Heautontimoroumenos* 273 *mane: hoc quod coepi primum enarrem,* "hang on – let me first tell you all of what I have started [to tell]"; and while the lack of identification of the prologue-speaker is consistent with epic, the overt raising of the issue of his identity undermines the silence of epic on this topic and seems once again to echo comedy – with *quis ille* compare Plautus *Aulularia* 1 *ne quis miretur qui sim, paucis eloquar,* "in case anyone wonders who I am, I shall briefly tell you."

These signals of 'low' genres are however matched by 'high' epic indicators. The phrasal shape of *figuras fortunasque hominum … exordior,* "X and Y*(-que)* I tell of," is a classic opening pattern in epic – cf. *Aeneid* 1.1 *arma virumque cano,* "I sing of arms and a hero," Silius Italicus *Punica* 1.1 *ordior arma* "I begin a tale of arms," Statius *Thebaid* 1.1-3 *Fraternas acies alternaque regna … evolvere … menti calor incidit,* "inspiration has come upon my spirit to unfold the tale of the brothers' armies and the alternating rule." The topic of metamorphosis also introduces the central theme of a very particular epic, Ovid's homonymous *Metamorphoses*: *figuras fortunasque hominum in alias imagines conversas et in se rursum mutuo nexu refectas,* "a tale of men's shapes and fortunes transformed into different appearances and back again into themselves by mutual connection," echoes Ovid *Met.* 1.1-3 *mutatas dicere formas* "to tell of changed forms" in both syntax and subject , and modern scholarship leaves us in no doubt that Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* knows and exploits its Ovidian counterpart.[10]

Thus at the beginning of the *Metamorphoses* we see a characteristic mixture of epic with 'lower' and less 'dignified' genres, a mixture which is programmatic for the whole work. As we shall see, it is also programmatic for its beginnings and endings of books, which present a clear mixture of epic and non-epic elements. The opening of Book 1 as a whole is of course the prologue just discussed; but the 'second' opening of the narrative proper after the prologue is also worth

---

[10] On the resemblances between the Apuleian and Ovidian *Metamorphoses* cf. esp. Scotti (1982), Bandini (1986), Krabbe (1989), and Müller-Reineke (2000).

notice in the context of generic signals. At 1.2 the principal narrator Lucius, who may or may not be the speaker of the prologue itself, begins the story with a statement about a journey: *Thessaliam … ex negotio petebam,* "I was on the way to Thessaly on business." This statement, and the fact that the narrator soon meets a fellow-traveller with whom he converses, irresistibly recalls the openings of various Platonic dialogues where a journey with a destination turns out to be the occasion of a meeting which stimulates the dialogue – most famously the opening of the *Republic* (327a "I went down to the Piraeus yesterday …").[11] This forms a second beginning of the book, neatly echoing the character of the prologue's opening with its Platonising pseudo-dialogism; but even here it is possible to see an epic echo.

At *Aeneid* 1.34-5, after the prologue of the poem has been emphatically rounded off by the famous *sententia* of 1.33 *tantae molis erat Romanam condere gentem,* the narrative proper begins with a voyage described with a scene-setting imperfect tense: *vix e conspectu Siculae telluris in altum / vela dabant laeti et spumas salis aere ruebant,* "they were happily sailing just in sight of the land of Sicily, running through the salt spray with their bronze keel." Here again we find a new beginning from the journey of the protagonist with a stated geographical destination, a journey which is rudely interrupted by the wrath of Juno just as the journey of Lucius is interrupted by the tale of Aristomenes which narrates the wrath of the goddess-like witch Meroe (*feminam divinam,* 1.8).

At the end of Book 1 Lucius, having had the fish he bought at the market trampled to bits by the officious magistrate Pythias, his erstwhile schoolfriend from Athens, retires to bed without his dinner (1.26.6): *somno non cibo gravatus … in cubiculum reversus optatae me quieti reddidi,* "weighed down with sleep rather than food I returned to my bedroom and gave myself up to longed-for rest." This supperless slumber at book-end clearly parodies the endings of epic books[12] where gods and heroes retire to sleep having eaten their fill: the first book of the *Iliad* ends with the sweet and replete sleep of Zeus, while *Iliad* 7 ends with Trojans and Greeks both feasting and

[11] For other Platonic openings where journey leads to dialogue cf. *Theaetetus* 142a, *Parmenides* 126a; for further Platonic literary allusions in the *Metamorphoses* cf. e.g. Harrison (2000) 224-5, 252-9.

[12] This is noted in general terms by Junghanns (1932) 126.

sleeping, and sleep by itself is a common epic book-end, found in *Iliad* 9, *Odyssey* 5, 14, 16, and 19. Lucius, in fact, is more like the exhausted Odysseus sleeping in leaves at the end of *Odyssey* 5, perhaps a comic meiosis of that famous epic scene, especially as in the next book of the *Metamorphoses* Lucius soon (2.2) meets a rich local woman (Byrrhaena), just as Odysseus meets Nausicaa in the following book of the *Odyssey* (6.120 ff.).[13] This ending is a particular form of the use of night as a book-ending, common in Homer: *Iliad* 1, 7, and 9 and *Odyssey* 1, 5, 6, 7, 14, 16, and 19 all end with night. This is of course a familiar pattern of closure in ancient and later literature,[14] but its epic colour is likely to be most relevant for Apuleius.

<u>Book 2</u>. Book 2 opens with the young Lucius awaking at dawn and keenly exploring his new surroundings in Hypata (2.1.1-2): *ut primum nocte discussa sol novus diem fecit … curiose singula considerabam*, "as soon as the new sun shook off night and brought forth the day … I began to explore everything with curiosity." Here in his dawn action the young Lucius is like the young and keen Telemachus in *Odyssey* 2 and 17, just as he resembles Telemachus in his educative trip abroad.[15] Dawn at book-opening is in general a standard Homeric feature (cf. also *Iliad* 8, 11, 19, *Odyssey* 3, 5, 8, 16), though we do not here find a close imitation of an epic dawn-formula (contrast Book 3 below); here this mildly epic marker is typically juxtaposed with the undignified *curiositas* of Lucius, his besetting fault which is to get him into such trouble in the course of the novel.[16]

Book 2 closes with the drunken Lucius going to bed thinking that he has defeated and killed three robbers, which later turn out to be three magically animated wine-skins (2.32.7): end of (epic?) day – *meque … pugna trium latronum in vicem Geryoneae caedis fatigatum lecto simul et somno tradidi*, "and, tired as I was from the fight with three robbers in the manner of the slaying of Geryon, I consigned myself to my bed and to sleep." The ending of night and sleep picks up that of Book 1, again with a comic twist: Lucius' lofty self-

---

[13] On these Odyssean aspects see Harrison (1990a) and Frangoulidis (1992a), (1992b), (1992c).

[14] On night as poetic closure in Greco-Roman and later literature cf. Curtius (1953) 89-91; on patterns of book-closure more generally see Fowler (2000) 251-9 and Roberts, Dunn, Fowler (1997).

[15] For Lucius as a comic Telemachus cf. Harrison (1990a).

[16] On *curiositas* in the *Metamorphoses* see conveniently De Filippo (1990).

comparison here with Hercules (which he will stress even more in his speech of defence in Book 3.3.19), showing his claims to literary learning,[17] is highly amusing in the circumstances of his low-life drunkenness. The epic pattern of night and sleep ending a book (as in Book 1, above) is here reinforced by an epic verbal echo: *Geryoneae caedis,* "the slaying of Geryon" surely picks up Vergil's characterisation of Hercules in the *Aeneid* (8.202) as *tergemini nece Geryonae spoliisque superbus,* "proud with the slaying and spoils of triform Geryon." But Lucius' drunkenness makes him much more like the greedy and drunken Hercules of comic tradition whom we find in Aristophanes' *Frogs* and Propertius 4.9,[18] an apt deflation of a great hero in the context of a low-life 'Milesian' novel.

Book 3. Book 3 opens with a description of dawn which clearly echoes and parodies the elaborate dawn-formulas of Homer (3.1.1): *commodum punicantibus phaleris Aurora roseum quatiens lacertum caelum inequitabat, et me securae quieti revulsum nox diei reddidit,* "Dawn with her pink harness, flexing her rosy arm, was just beginning to drive across the sky, and night tore me from careless sleep and returned me to day." The dawn-formula "When rosy-fingered dawn appeared, coming early in the morning" begins three books of the *Odyssey* (2, 7, 17) and is one of the most familiar Homeric formulas, much imitated by later writers.[19] Here the context makes clear the parodic tone,[20] and the focus on the horse's harness rather than the more poetic fingers of Dawn helps to bring the image down to earth a little: Lucius wakes up with a hangover for a day of comic reckoning, with *revulsus,* "torn away [from sleep]," strongly suggesting that he is unwilling to rise and face the consequences of the wine-skin escapade which closed the previous book.

At the end of Book 3 (3.29.8) Lucius-ass declines a dangerous opportunity to eat roses and return to human form (if he reveals himself as human now he may be killed by the bandits): *tunc igitur a rosis et quidem necessario temperavi et casum praesentem tolerans in asini faciem frena rodebam,* "on that occasion therefore I refrained

[17] On Lucius-narrator's half-baked literary learning cf. Harrison (2000) 220.

[18] On this comic Hercules cf. Galinsky (1972) 81-100.

[19] See the excellent discussion at Van der Paardt (1971) 23-4. Note that Homericising dawn-formulas can occur outside book-beginnings in the *Met.*; cf. e.g. 6.11.4 (very similar to 3.1.1), where the epicising context of Psyche's labours is surely influential on the epic tone (Harrison [1998a] 62).

[20] So Westerbrink (1978) 65.

from eating the roses as was indeed necessary, and, tolerating my present situation, I chewed my bridle still in the form of an ass."[21] This is a 'cliff-hanger' type of closure, where a book closes with a major plot-element unresolved, an inducement to read on now familiar from the serial narratives of modern popular culture divided into many episodes (especially television soap-operas); this type of closure is more common in the later books of the *Metamorphoses* (cf. Books 7 and 8 below) as the plot gathers pace towards its dramatic dénouement in Book 11. "When will Lucius achieve retransformation? Find out in the next book ….." This device clearly exploits the tension between book-segmentation and plot-segmentation, and the natural desire for some form of plot-closure even at the level of book-closure,[22] but in terms of literary history it can be said to be derived from Ovid's homonymous *Metamorphoses*.

That epic poem constantly plays on this tension between plot-episode and book-structure.[23] This technique begins as early as the first book, which ends with Phaethon arriving at the home of his father the Sun, where the alert reader knows he will come to a bad end, an episode narrated in the next book (1.779): *patriosque adit inpiger ortus*, "he arrived eagerly at his father's place of rising." Here 'eagerly' clearly looks forward to Phaethon's over-enthusiastic and disastrous handling of his father's chariot in the next book. Likewise Book 2 ends with the kidnap of Europa to Crete (what will happen to her?), Book 6 with the beginning of the Argonaut expedition, to be continued in the next book, Book 8 with a hint from Achelous of the story of his lost horn which he will tell fully in the next book, Book 12 with the preparations for the contest of Ajax and Odysseus which occupies the first half of Book 13, and Book 13 with Glaucus' flight to Circe which will lead to Scylla's transformation in Book 14.

Book 4. Book 4 opens at mid-day (4.1.1) *diem ferme circa medium*, "about the middle of the day." This is a prosaic time-indication, expressed with the very unliterary *ferme* and the very ordinary *circa*,[24] and a distinct contrast with the elaborate Homeric dawn-formulas of Book 3 (above) and Book 7 (below), a reminder of the naturally

[21] I here agree with Van der Paardt in reading *frena*, 'bridle', rather than *faena*, 'hay' (read by Robertson); see the argumentation in Van der Paardt (1971) 207.
[22] On the relationship of desire and narrative see Brooks (1984).
[23] Cf. Fowler (2000) 258-9, Holzberg (1998).
[24] For the lexical facts on these words see n. 49 below.

lower literary level of the novel. The ending of Book 4, on the other hand, has epic overtones, as we might expect in the more elevated literary texture of the Cupid and Psyche episode:[25] the heroine is wafted away to a *locus amoenus* and induced to sleep (4.35.4): *vallis subditae florentis caespitis gremio leniter delapsam reclinat*, "[the wind] lays [Psyche] gently down in the lap of a sunken valley with flourishing grass." Though Psyche does not fall asleep until the beginning of the next book, there is a clear suggestion that she will do so, which alludes to the epic closure already parodied in the endings of Book 1 and 2 (above). We might also see a specific allusion to the end of *Odyssey* 5, as at the end of Book 1 (above): Psyche like Odysseus has been rescued from a highly dangerous situation and arrives alone in a strange but welcoming place (cf. Phaecia), where in the following book she will meet an attractive member of the opposite sex (cf. Nausicaa). This is especially attractive given the echoes of the palace of Alcinous in the description of the palace of Cupid at the beginning of the next Apuleian book.

<u>Book 5</u>. At the beginning of Book 5 the heroine first goes to sleep and then awakes refreshed. Here we find a reversal of the usual epic pattern of sleep at book-end (see Books 1 and 2 above), combined with a more conventional book-beginning, with the book's action starting at the start of the day. This distortion of the normal narrative parameters might be seen as a magic variation on the normal human timetable; this is an enchanted world of fairy palaces and disembodied voices where the usual conventions do not necessarily apply. But in epic terms, the description of Cupid's palace at the beginning of this book (5.1.2 ff.) clearly echoes that of the Palace of the Sun at the beginning of Ovid *Metamorphoses* 2.[26] This structural echo evokes its larger context in the story of Phaethon, which is here echoed in several ways. As noted at the end of Book 3 (above), the division of a narrative episode across book-limits is a technique from Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, but here there seems to be an explicit allusion to the break between the first two books of Ovid's work. In both cases a young and inexperienced human character, loved by a god, moves to that god's divine palace. This move is followed by disaster consequent on the human character's ignoring of a warning from that god;

[25] Cf. in general Harrison (1998a) 57.
[26] Cf. Harrison (1998a) 60.

just as Cupid emphatically warns Psyche against trying to discover his identity (5.11), so the Sun firmly warns Phaethon not to drive the chariot (*Met.* 2.49-102). This is another epic identity for Psyche.[27]

At the end of Book 5 Venus departs, annoyed with the goddesses Ceres and Juno (5.31.7): *concito gradu pelago viam capessit*, "with hastened pace she made her way to the ocean." Departure is a natural mode of closure in ancient literature,[28] but here again there is an epic flavour. No fewer than three books of the *Aeneid* end with the hero's departure. In *Aeneid* 2 Aeneas leaves Troy for the mountains with his father on his shoulders (2.804); in *Aeneid* 6 he leaves the Underworld to return to Caieta (6.900-1); and in *Aeneid* 8 he rises up to leave with his new shield on his shoulder (8.731). Here Venus' departure is irritated and undignified, especially in contrast with her previous departure to the sea at 4.31, with full epic colour and allusion,[29] and the language reflects this; as at the beginning of Book 4, prosaic language (*viam capessere*, "make one's way," seems to be prosaic)[30] shows the 'low' level of the novelistic narrative register.

<u>Book 6</u>. Book 6 opens with the wandering Psyche reaching a temple (6.1.1-2): *interea Psyche variis iactabatur discursibus … prospecto templo quodam in ardui montis vertice … inquit*, "Meanwhile Psyche, tossed around in her various wanderings …spying a temple on the top of a lofty mountain, said …." Here there are multiple echoes of epic beginnings. The word *interea* begins *Aeneid* 5 and 11, while Psyche's wanderings and the verb *iactabatur*, "was tossed," recalls the wanderings of Aeneas as narrated at the beginning of *Aeneid* 1 (1.3 *multum ille terris <u>iactatus</u> et alto*), just as Psyche's later descent to the Underworld famously echoes the katabasis of Aeneas in *Aeneid* 6.[31] The opening of *Aeneid* 6 is also strongly echoed in the opening of this sixth book: though Psyche's initial anxiety recalls another book-opening, that of *Aeneid* 4.1 ff. and the anxiety of Dido,[32] the hero(ine)'s visit to a temple opening a book which climaxes in a descent to the underworld recalls Aeneas at the temple of

---

[27] A point not made in Harrison (1998a).
[28] Cf. Fowler (1997) 114.
[29] Cf. Harrison (1998a) 66.
[30] Paralleled on the PHI CD-ROM only at Livy 44.2.8 before Apuleius, who has six uses of the phrase (this passage and *Met.*1.14, 1.17, 5.31, 8.18, 8.21, and 9.36).
[31] Cf. Finkelpearl (1990).
[32] For Psyche and Dido cf. Harrison (1997) 62-3.

Apollo in Cumae at *Aeneid* 6.9-34.[33] Both temples are (naturally enough) in lofty positions (cf. *Aeneid* 6.9), and both temples provide a potential female helper for the protagonist – Ceres in Apuleius, well-disposed towards Psyche but forced to reject her pleas for help through Venus' greater power (6.2-3), and the Sibyl in Vergil, who will act as Aeneas' guide through the Underworld. Here the effect is one of epic elevation, as often in the relatively dignified story of Cupid and Psyche.

The end of Book 6 is another 'cliff-hanger' like that of Book 3. Lucius-ass has been condemned to a horrible death by the robbers and is fully expecting to perish (6.32.3): *quam meis tam magnis auribus accipiens quid aliud quam meum deflebam cadaver*, "hearing which [my sentence] with my great ears, I could do nothing but begin to lament for my own corpse." Will Lucius be slaughtered and have the girl sewn up inside his skin ? The basic technique of inter-book suspense may be Ovidian (see on Book 3 above), but the content is firmly low-life and sensationalist; such deaths fit the 'fatal charades' of the imperial Roman arena[34] rather than the epic battle-field. There may also be some ironic reference to death as a typical Vergilian book-closure (*Aeneid* 4, 5, 10 and 12 all end with death); here the concluding not-quite-death of an ass would be an amusing and low-life version of the closural death of a great epic character.[35]

<u>Book 7</u>. The opening of Book 7 presents the most elaborate dawn-formula of the novel (7.1): *ut primum tenebris abiectis dies inalbebat et candidum solis curriculum cuncta conlustrabat, quidam de numero latronum pervenit*, "as soon as darkness was cast away and the day began to brighten, and the sun's bright chariot began to illuminate all things, one of the robber-band arrived." As at the start of Book 3, this elaborately simultaneous opening of book and day is ultimately Homeric in origin (though the chariot of the Sun is Vergilian),[36] but two elements combine to adapt the epic dawn-formula to

[33] Cf. Harrison (1998a) 61.

[34] Cf. Coleman (1990); the planned copulation of Lucius-ass and the condemned woman in the arena at Corinth in *Metamorphoses* 10 is clearly related to 'fatal charades', though it does not re-enact any known mythological story.

[35] *GCA* (1981) 79 note "a touch of humour" in "the desperate-sounding sentence."

[36] For the chariot of the Sun in a dawn context cf. *Aeneid* 5.739. This Apuleian passage was long falsely thought to be an echo of Ennius; for an authoritative discussion see Skutsch (1985) 785.

its different Apuleian context. The Homeric topos is overextended in typically Apuleian epideictic style, with alliteration, rhyming and elaborate verbs of select lexical colouring,[37] while the presence of typically novelistic robbers stresses the low-life world of Roman prose fiction.

The ending of Book 7 presents a similar balance between high/epic and low/novelistic elements. Here as at the end of Book 6, Lucius-ass is again in danger, this time from a vengeful mother, who tries to kill him by thrusting a blazing brand between his legs, but he escapes by emitting a stream of diarrhoea – (7.32.3-4) *qua caecitate atque faetore tandem fugata est a mea pernicie: ceterum titione delirantis Althaeae Meleager asinus interisset,* "by being blinded in this way and through the evil smell she was at last repelled from destroying me; otherwise an asinine Meleager would have perished by means of the burning brand of a crazy Althaea." The allusion here is clearly to Ovid's version of the Meleager/Althaea story at *Metamorphoses* 8.445-515 with its 'mad scene', though this mythological story was much treated in drama.[38] The Apuleian text both comically lowers the epic allusion through its scatological detail, and provides a clever variation on the epic model: both have the mother and glowing brand, but the Apuleian mother is avenging the death of her son, inverting the Ovidian mother who is avenging the death of her brothers on her son. The low lexical level of *delirantis,* 'crazy' (Plautus *Am.* 727, Terence *Ph.* 997) clearly adds to the comically subversive effect. The mythological allusion matches that at the end of Book 2; once again we see the mythological learning of the narrator Lucius with his cultural pretensions, showing off his somewhat basic literary repertoire.[39]

Book 8. The beginning of Book 8, like that of Book 4, presents a plain and prosaic time-indication (8.1.1): *Noctis gallicinio venit quidam iuvenis,* "at cockcrow at the end of the night a young man came"; this is underlined by the colloquial level of the term *gallicinium,* 'cockcrow', first found in Petronius,[40] stressing that this is a low and ordinary inversion of the epic dawn-opening seen in Books 3 and 7. The ending of Book 8 (8.31.5) is another 'cliff-hanger', re-

[37] See *GCA* (1981) 80-1 (note that *inalbebat* is a *hapax legomenon*).
[38] See *GCA* (1981) 273-4; Van der Paardt (2001).
[39] See n. 17 above.
[40] Cf. *GCA* (1985) 27.

calling those of Books 3 and 6 with a similarly suspenseful imperfect verb: *destinatae iam lanienae cultros acuebat*, "[the cook] began to sharpen his knives for the planned butchery." Here Lucius-ass is about to be slaughtered to replace a stolen joint of meat, an undignified and comic situation; the prosaic and comic vocabulary of tools and cooking (note that the cook is a figure of ancient comedy and certainly not of epic)[41] emphasise the low-life tone in this Apuleian version of an originally Ovidian technique (see on Book 3 above).

Book 9. This book opens with the cook about to butcher Lucius-ass (see above) and the latter ready to flee (9.1.1): *sic ille nequissimus carnifex contra me manus impias obarmabat. At ego … lanienam imminentem fuga vitare statui*, "Thus that nefarious executioner began to arm his wicked hands against me. But I … decided to escape this imminent butchery by fleeing." Though it is not noted by commentators, this 'cinematic' switch of perspective from one party to another, articulated here by *sic*, 'thus' and *at*, 'but', is a type of book-opening found in epic: this ninth opening in fact matches the opening of *Iliad* 9: "So (ὣς = *sic*) the Trojans kept watch; but the Achaeans (αὐτὰρ 'Αχαιοὺς = *at ego*) were possessed by heaven-sent panic." Whether or not a particular allusion is felt here, the Apuleian situation is clearly an epic parody in general terms: the anticipated 'battle' of the cook and ass (*obarmabat*, 'arm', suggests an epic warrior) is here a comic version of Homeric warfare, and as at the beginning of Book 6, the opening of Book 9 of the *Metamorphoses* seems to pick up the opening of its numerical counterpart from the *Iliad* – an intertextual technique found elsewhere in Latin literature.[42]

The ending of Book 9 provides a proverbial closure (9.42.4): *unde etiam de prospectu et umbra asini natum est frequens proverbium*, "and this is also the origin of the common proverb about the peering and the shadow of an ass." As the Groningen commentators rightly explain, this combines two proverbs, both referring to the frivolous bringing of lawsuits; they also rightly point to "the comical note provided by the proverbs" here.[43] As well as marking out an Apuleian

---

[41] Cf. Dohm (1964) on the comic cook in general; on other Apuleian uses of comic cooks cf. May (1998).

[42] A good example would be the way in which the Erichtho-necromancy of Lucan's sixth book echoes the katabasis of *Aeneid* 6: see Masters (1992) 179 n.1.

[43] *GCA* (1995) 353-4.

interest, as the Groningen commentators also note,[44] the homely tone of proverbial discourse again stresses the 'low' level of the novel by referring to a sub-literary and popular genre.

Book 10. The beginning of Book 10 (10.1.1): *die sequenti*, "on the next day," shows the same prosaic tone as the beginnings of Book 4 and 8 (see above), no doubt connected with narrative pace (the plot needs to advance swiftly here given that Book 10 has a relatively large number of items to get through).[45] The ending of Book 10, on the other hand, is epically elaborate and heightened: (10.35.5) *nam et ultimam diei metam curriculum solis deflexerat et vespertinae me quieti traditum dulcis somnus oppresserat*, "for the chariot of the Sun had passed the last turning-post of the day, and sweet sleep had overcome me as I was consigned to the restfulness of evening." Here we clearly have a version of the epic 'day-end and sleep' ending (see on the end of Book 1 above); note that the epic chariot of the Sun reappears from the opening of Book 7. The lofty tone here is unadulterated by low-life or popular elements; this well suits the portentous context, where Lucius is about to have his dream of Isis at the opening of Book 11, arguably one of the most elevated episodes of the novel. The special significance of this important moment is shown by the fact that this is the only description of nightfall at book-end in the *Metamorphoses*.[46]

There is also a clear resemblance between Lucius' closural sleep here and the closural near-sleep of Psyche at the end of Book 4 (see above). This is part of the way in which the Cupid and Psyche inserted tale functions as a *mise en abyme* of the whole novel;[47] both Lucius and Psyche have escaped from mortal danger, go to sleep in a quiet refuge, and are about to face a series of initiatory tests and adventures from which they will emerge with success and (quasi-) divine status.

Book 11. This last book begins with a time-indication and the rising of an astronomical body, but both are perhaps surprising after the

---

[44] *GCA* (1995) 354; on Apuleius' lost work of paroemiography see Harrison (2000) 20-1.

[45] On the narrative tempo in this book cf. *GCA* (2000) 13.

[46] Cf. *GCA* (2000) 415-16, a good discussion of this ending and its epic links.

[47] On *mise en abyme* see Dällenbach (1989); on the correspondences between Lucius and Psyche cf. e.g. Dowden (1998), though I would not agree with his religious interpretation.

openings of Book 3 and 7, since the time is not dawn but early in the night, and the body is the moon and not the sun (11.1.1): *circa primam ferme noctis vigiliam experrectus pavore subito, video praemicantis lunae candore nimio completum orbem commodum marinis emergentem fluctibus* … "At just about the first watch of the night I was awoken by a sudden panic and saw the full circle of the moon, gleaming out with a mighty brightness, rising from the waves." This modification of other opening formulas suggests perhaps that something unusual is about to happen (as indeed it is); just as his rest at the end of Book 10 echoes that of Psyche at the end of Book 4 (see above), so Lucius' awakening here is marked by a dream-like removal from normal time-conventions which corresponds well with Psyche's somewhat surreal awakening in the palace of Cupid at the beginning of Book 5: both protagonists are about to face a miraculous encounter with the divinity whose patronage will revolutionise their lives. Lucius' awakening here also appropriately recalls his dawn-awakening in Hypata at the beginning of Book 2, the start of a regrettable episode which led to his disastrous metamorphosis, a metamorphosis which the events of the forthcoming book are about to reverse. More interestingly from the generic point of view, this scene clearly recalls the epic book-opening of heroes failing to sleep in the middle of night, usually owing to heroic emotion or plans (here despair) – as in *Iliad* 10 (Agamemnon, planning tactics), 24 (Achilles, grieving for Patroclus), *Odyssey* 20 (Odysseus, planning his revenge). Again as at the end of Book 10 the tone (though not the vocabulary) is unambiguously elevated (lexically, the select *praemicantis*, first found in Apuleius,[48] and the poetic description of the moon's orb rub shoulders with the highly prosaic *circa, ferme* and *commodum*),[49] once more suiting the portentous context.

The ending of Book 11 and the closure of the whole novel is famously open (11.30.5): *rursus denique quaqua raso capillo collegii vetustissimi et sub illis Sullae temporibus conditi munia, non obumbrato vel obtecto calvitio, sed quoquoversus obvio, gaudens obibam*, "finally, with my head once again shaved all over, and not covering or protecting my baldness, but revealing it openly everywhere, I be-

---

[48] Cf. *GCA* (2000) 56; as Koziol (1872) 280, notes, this is one of a number of verbs with this prefix first appearing in Apuleius.

[49] On the highly prosaic/colloquial tone of these words see *ThLL* 3.1079.6 ff., 6.1.492.11 ff. and 3.1926.59 ff.

gan joyfully to fulfil the duties of a priestly college of great antiquity, founded in those times of Sulla." This ending has no epic features: the stress on the first-person autodiegetic narrator, with Lucius still telling his own story, is a strong contrast with the recessive and undercharacterised narrator of the epic tradition, as is the suggestion of continuing autobiography in the unresolved imperfect but final verb. Likewise, the stress on Lucius' devoted baldness strikes an unepic (and, I would argue, purely comic) note; baldness is distinctly undignified in the ancient world and in its most elevated literary genres – the only character with hair loss in the *Iliad* is Thersites (*Iliad* 2.219).[50] Thus the closure of this text finally marks it as non-epic: a story of over-curiosity, asinine transformation, sex, witchcraft and religious (?pseudo-) conversion[51] in the end differs fundamentally from tales of heroic endeavour.

Overview and Conclusion

A number of significant general features emerge from this survey. First, the predominance of time-indications: of the twenty-two beginnings and endings analysed above, twelve (more than half) are markers of time in some sense.[52] These vary in elaboration and generic colour from full-scale opening epic dawn-formulas (Book 3 and 7) to the briefest prosaic markers of time of day or sequence (openings of Book 4, Book 8, and Book 10), but all depend to some degree on the epic tradition of time-markers at the extremities of books, suitably varied and modified for a lower novelistic context. Second, the distribution and sequencing: more elaborate and literary openings and closures of books are more common in the first half of the novel, with Books 8 and 9 less colourful in this respect, perhaps in order to stress significant literary links nearer the beginning of the work, and also matching the way in which narrative pace quickens in

[50] See Kirk (1985) 140: "the pointed, balding cranium … make[s] Thersites a monstrosity by heroic standards'; for the indignity of baldness at Rome, and ridicule directed at it, cf. Juvenal 4.38 and 6.533 (the latter directed against Isiac devotees), Martial's attacks on bald men (cf. Howell [1995] 133-4), and Syme (1957) 343, Jones (1996) 140.

[51] My own view is that the religious material of Book 11 is ultimately satirical – cf. Harrison (2000) 238-52.

[52] This aspect has been well noted by the Groningen commentaries – cf. *GCA* (1977) 22, (1985) 1, (1995) 33, (2000) 51.

the later books, with events taking precedence over elaboration of narrative voice. Thirdly, the interrelationship of openings and closures can make important and subtle literary points: good examples here are the clear parallels between the characters Psyche and Lucius at the ends of Books 4 and 10 and the beginnings of Books 5 and 11, and the way in which the opening of Book 6 certainly recalls that of *Aeneid* 6 and that of Book 9 more arguably echoes that of *Iliad* 9.

Two fundamental conclusions may be drawn, neither surprising. First, that at these marked moments at the beginnings and ends of books the *Metamorphoses* constantly looks back to epic as a model for its continuous multi-book fictional narrative, but constantly marks itself by parody and variation as generically 'lower' than its more 'dignified' literary ancestor. There are interesting parallels here with the *Satyrica* of Petronius, where I have argued for similar epic-type book-divisions, not preserved in our chaotic manuscript transmission of the work.[53] Second, it seems hard to believe that these allusions are not authorially planned: the scribal subscriptions in F, the oldest and most important manuscript of the *Metamorphoses*,[54] makes it clear that these book-divisions go back at least to the recension of the novel carried out by Crispus Sallustius at Rome and Constantinople at the end of the fourth century AD, and the subtle and literary nature of the way in which they allude to the book-divisions of epic narratives clearly reinforces the belief that they are Apuleian in origin.[55]

---

[53] Harrison (1998c).

[54] For the textual tradition of the *Metamorphoses* cf. Reynolds (1983) 15-16.

[55] As suggested in *GCA* (1985) 1 n. 1. This is clearly not the case for the book-divisions marked in Apuleius' *Florida*, but may well be true for that in Apuleius' *Apologia*: cf. Harrison (2000) 48, 90-4, 132-5. Both these works share the textual transmission of the *Metamorphoses* via F and Sallustius.

This paper was delivered at the Classical Association in Liverpool and at Emory University as well as at ICAN 2000. I am grateful to all these audiences for their comments, and especially to Niall Slater for his helpful response at Emory.

IN MEDIIS REBUS: BEGINNING AGAIN IN THE MIDDLE OF THE ANCIENT NOVEL

Stephen Nimis

This article is part of a larger project on the ancient novels which I have dubbed the 'prosaics' of the ancient novels. By that term I mean an analysis that focuses on the ancient novels as a process rather than as a finished product, as a signifying practice rather than as an object, taking my cue from a book on the rise of French prose in the middle ages by W. Godzich and J. Kittay:

> Trained as we are to perceive texts as totalities, we seek to apprehend their structure and, in the description of that structure, to assert our mastery over the text. Prosaics seeks instead to espouse the movement of the text as it manages the economy of its discourses, to establish where the thresholds of decision arise, what the decisions are, and what their motivations and determinations as well as their consequences have been. In other words, we must learn to follow the processive threading of the text.[1]

This 'prosaics' approach is contrasted to a 'poetics' of form as Godzich and Kittay turn their attention to the special character of prose, defined as a discourse no longer organized around the activity of a performer (like the verse genres of antiquity and the middle ages), and the way that elements of the performer's activity become redistributed and absorbed in the emerging practice of prose. Of particular interest is the way the cohesive and organizational functions of the performer's presence becomes transformed in a discourse that is made up entirely of words. How can we think of this aspect of our texts that replaces the activity of the performer with words?

Godzich and Kittay make a preliminary distinction between the referential and text-economic aspects of a text. The former is concerned with the relationship of the text to its subject matter, whereas the text-economic forces of a discourse have to do with its forward movement, its ability to continue as text and not collapse under its own weight. 'Constructing' a text can be likened to the process of building a wall from bricks and mortar. The bricks can be thought of

[1] Godzich, Kittay (1987) 48. See Nimis (1994).

as the themes and ideas of a work; the mortar as the various means by which these bricks are arranged and presented, the ‘rhetoric’ of the text, as we say, the means by which the assent of the audience is gained, but also the means by which infelicities and gaps in the bricks can be glossed over. To take an example from the world of performance, an orator must engage in a to and fro movement (bricks and mortar) whereby he proposes certain formulations and then seeks assent to the correctness of these formulations. He shifts back and forth between two modes, making statements about the world as though they were self-evident, and then switching to a text-economic mode in order to elicit consent to his formulations; he does so by dialoguing with the audience, by saying things like, “Don’t you agree?” “Am I right?” or other such ‘rhetorical questions’. This need not be an explicit request for an expression of assent from the audience – indeed that can be rather dangerous; the orator need only mark the moment through certain formal devices, such as gestures, pauses, significant intonations, etc., encoding the moment of the audience’s assent, for that is all that is needed. In this way, step by step, brick by brick, the orator is able to create a discourse that cumulatively appears to the audience to be a progressive revelation of their own firmly held opinions.

In a narrative organized around the activity of one or more performers, such as epic or drama, devices that serve to sustain and knit together the various elements of the story can also take the form of some non-verbal activity. But in narratives like the ancient novels, where no performative presence or activity is presumed, where everything is just words, devices that serve to sustain and link together the various elements of the story can be marked by a switch from narrative to some other mode: description, summary, allusion, etc. In my previous work on the ancient novels I have identified various examples of such ‘mortar moments’.[2] What I want to address in this article is the case when a significant structural seam appears because the author makes a major adjustment to the direction of his story, and hence my title, second beginnings in the ancient novel, particularly second beginnings that occur in the middle of the novel, *in mediis rebus*. This topic was suggested to me in part by an article entitled ‘Proems in the Middle’ by G. B. Conte, who identifies a Hellenistic

[2] Nimis (1998), (1999), (2001).

tradition, beginning with Callimachus and imitated by Vergil and others, of having a second proem half way through a work, which is specifically a place to discuss poetics and literary purpose. The regular recurrence in Vergil and others of a proem in the middle as a privileged locus of literary consciousness is described by Conte as a formal literary convention that eventually achieves the status of a rhetorical institution.[3] I don't intend to dispute Conte's account of these proems in the middle in the works of Vergil and others; instead I wish to draw a contrast with his poetics of form by giving a prosaics account of certain medial moments in the ancient novels, focusing on how they function as text-economic elements.

To help draw the distinction, we can pose the following question: How much of a novel story does one have to have composed before beginning to write a novel? This is a seemingly paradoxical question, except that a poetics approach takes for granted that the definitive form of a literary work has eradicated all traces of the composition process itself in making some purpose or set of purposes permeate the work from one end to the other, so that at every point of the final product the author always already knows the rest of the story. Conte is quite clear about this:

> Two different problems must be distinguished. The first is the diachrony of composition, the ups and downs that accompanied the composition of [Ennius'] *Annals*, and the resulting collocation of those two lines at one or another stage in the process of composition; the second is the definitive form in which the *Annals* appear (or rather, appeared to its ancient readers) at the end of that process.[4]

Whether such a clear distinction between process and product is valid for all works of literature is dubious, but long works of prose like the Greek novels, with their non-traditional plots and characters, have a special claim to a different assumption: that an author's intentions and interests might evolve in the very act of composing the novel, and that evidence of this development will be legible in the finished work. Indeed, it is a reasonable hypothesis that an ancient novelist would begin composing a story with a general idea of the whole plot, and with the first half or so worked out in some detail; and when he arrived at the middle, before launching into the less thought-out second half, he had to pause and reassess and decide

[3] Conte (1992) 153.
[4] Conte (1992) 155.

what sort of novel he was going to write from this point on, a point he had reached in some sense for the first time. As such, the presence of 'text-economic' forces and functions, self-reflexive 'mortar moments', at this point in the text can be analyzed from a prosaics standpoint to help us identify the process by which the text effects a redirection of the story, and perhaps identify what led to that adjustment.

I have chosen two of our extant novels, Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe* and Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe* for consideration. Both of these novels have strong claims to being especially well-formed 'objects' that can be profitably assessed by a poetics of form. Both Perry and Reardon, for example, consider Chariton's novel to represent a kind of ideal example of the genre.[5] *Daphnis and Chloe* has been the object of numerous studies that focus on the architectonics of form in the story.[6] While not denying the interest of these 'poetics' approaches, I would like to foreground the heterogeneity of these texts by focusing on the text-economic elements that bind together disparate elements, that reveal certain inconcinnities in the very act of covering them up. The point is not that these novels have no structure, but rather that their composition is a dialectic of tentative form and moving forward: *prorsus*, the Latin word from which our word 'prose' derives. In these two novels there is a fairly well-defined caesura in the middle of the text marked by a combination of thematic and formal elements. I want to pay special attention to the way this point in the text is marked by simultaneous gestures of tentative closure and new beginning.

The very middle of Chariton's novel spans the last several sentences of book 4 and the beginning of book 5, and is remarkable because it contains almost every sort of mortar imaginable in a prose discourse. For convenience's sake I will quote the passage in English (4.7.3-5.1.2).[7]

> While [Mithridates] was still pondering these matters and meditating revolt, a message came that Dionysius had set out from Miletus and was bringing Callirhoe with him. This upset Mithridates more than the summons to trial. Bewailing his lot he said, "What have I to hope for if I stay? <u>Fortune</u> turns on me in every way. Well, perhaps the king

[5] Perry (1967), Reardon (1991).
[6] MacQueen (1990) is the most sustained such account.
[7] The translation is that of Goold (1995), slightly modified.

will take pity on me since I have done no wrong; and if I should have to die, I shall see Callirhoe once more. At the trial I shall keep Chaereas and Polycharmus with me, not only as advocates, but as witnesses too." Accordingly he ordered all his household to accompany him, and set out from Caria in good spirits, confident that he would not be found guilty of any crime. So they saw him off, not with tears, but with sacrificial rites and a solemn escort.

In addition to this expedition from Caria, Eros was dispatching another from Ionia – more distinguished, for its beauty was more conspicuous and more regal. Rumor sped ahead of the lady, announcing to all men that Callirhoe was at hand: the celebrated Callirhoe, nature's masterpiece,

"like Artemis or golden Aphrodite." (Hom. *Od.* 17.37)

The report of the trial made her more famous. Whole cities came to meet her; people flocked in and packed the streets to see her; and all thought her still lovelier than rumor had made her out. The felicitations Dionysius received caused him distress, and the extent of his good fortune only made him more fearful, for he was an educated man and was aware how inconstant Eros is – that is why poets and sculptors depict him with bow and arrows and associate him with fire, of all things the most light and unstable. He began to recollect ancient legends and all the changes that had come over their beautiful women. In short, Dionysius was frightened of everything. He saw all men as his rivals – not just his opponent in the trial, but the very judge; he regretted, in fact, more rashly revealing the affair to Pharnaces,

"when he could have slept and kept his loved one"

(Men. *Misoumenos*).

Keeping watch over Callirhoe in Miletus was one thing; in the whole of Asia, it was another matter. Nonetheless, he kept his secret to the end; he did not tell his wife the reason for the journey but pretended that the King had summoned him to consult him about affairs in Ionia. Callirhoe was distressed to be taken far from the Greek sea; as long as she could see the harbors of Miletus she had the impression that Syracuse was not far away; and Chaereas's tomb in Miletus was a great comfort to her.

How Callirhoe, the most beautiful of women, married Chaereas, the handsomest of men, by Aphrodite's management; how in a fit of lover's jealousy Chaereas struck her, and to all appearances she died; how she had a costly funeral and then, just as she came out of her coma in the funeral vault, tomb robbers carried her away from Sicily by night, sailed to Ionia, and sold her to Dionysius; Dionysius's love for her, her fidelity to Chaereas, the need to marry caused by her pregnancy; Theron's confession, Chaereas's journey across the sea in search of his wife; how he was captured, sold, and taken to Caria with his friend Polycharmus; how Mithridates discovered his identity as he was on the point of death and tried to restore the lovers to each other;

> how Dionysius found this out through a letter and complained to Pharnaces, who reported it to the King, and the King summoned both of them to judgment–this has all been set out in the story so far. Now I shall narrate what happened next.

First note that I have underlined three words, Fortune, Eros and Rumor, (Τύχη, Ἔρως, and Φήμη) that are portrayed in the text as what we call personifications. Eros is a mythological person in a more traditional sense, but in Chariton he appears and functions in much the same way as other more abstract agents, such as Fortune and Rumor. In fact we are told later in this same passage that Eros is a lover of novelties (φιλόκαινος), an epithet also used to describe Τύχη, since both like to set up paradoxical situations and outcomes. As such, Eros and Fortune are figures of the author himself, who also delights, so it would seem, in telling novelties and setting up paradoxical outcomes (see also Whitmarsh in the present volume). This accumulation of personified agents here raises the more general question of why they appear in the novels, and they call attention to an important aspect of prose discourse in general.

The introduction of personifications, such as Fortune and Eros, are infusions of narrative direction and energy into the text, explicit examples of the exercise of authorial control. These references invoke ideas about superhuman narrative forces whose operations are left intentionally vague, but their presence assures the reader temporarily that everything is progressing according to some kind of plan, that this is not just some random series of events. Such infusions of narrative direction occur at places where Chariton felt the need to recreate verbally the organizational function of a performer. Fortune and Eros are, so to speak, epiphanies of a performative presence that assure us that this narrative has some guiding spirit, that it is held together by forces of continuity and control. In the history of prose this is a transitional moment, occurring at a time when the model of performance was still strong. Eventually even such abstractions cease to be invoked for they call too much attention to themselves as seams, as mortar. So although they serve to sustain the continuity of the prose discourse, they are also signs that the author intuitively felt that some more explicit exercise of control was required to keep things going, and they are thus symptomatic of a 'mortar moment'.

In this context, I want to turn to the third personification in this passage, the word Φήμη, 'Rumor'. Φήμη has a broad range of

meanings in Greek, but in Chariton regularly refers to a discourse which comes out of nowhere, as it seems, to broadcast far and wide some news without any discrimination about who is hearing it, and without caring what use they will make of it. This is not unlike the novelist himself, who composes for an audience he can only imagine and whose response he cannot completely predict; and indeed, this self-reflexive gesture inaugurates an intense thematization of the process of composing this story here at its mid-point. Φήμη is personified ten times in the novel, almost all of them in the first half, and it is usually introduced in the same way.[8] Φήμη "runs everywhere" (διέτρεχε), she is "swift" (ταχεῖα), a "messenger" (ἄγγελος) spreading "strange new things" (παράδοξα καὶ καινά). The effect of this dispersion far and wide is often to bring people together (πάντες συνέτρεχον) to witness something for themselves, often the beautiful heroine. Just so, as a prose discourse the novel is spread far and wide without any particular source or authority, and without being directed at anyone in particular; and at the same time it constitutes a kind of seeing and knowing that aspires to universality and transcendence. The beauty of Callirhoe is not just the opinion of the author, nor of the heroine's family or her lovers; everyone comes to a general understanding and agreement. This is the aspiration of the novelist, not to persuade a particular jury, nor celebrate a particular victory, but to produce a discourse that transcends space and time. In our passage, for example, Φήμη announces to all men the presence of Callirhoe, the famous (περιβόητον, literally, "shouted all around"), the absolute perfection (κατόρθωμα) of nature herself. Whole cities come out to see Callirhoe – here the phrasing recalls the opening of the novel, when the heroine's φήμη brought suitors from everywhere (1.1.2). These references to completion and universal distribution and admiration reflect the author's own goals for his narrative, to bring his story, whose title is simply *Callirhoe*, to an end that will be the source of the same kind of universal admiration as his heroine.

Next we switch to the character Dionysius, who is oppressed by the fame of his wife and the attention she is receiving. He reflects on the fickleness of Eros, remembers how other stories of beautiful women ended in reversals (μεταβολαί). He becomes fearful of an

[8] Representative examples occur at 1.1.2; 1.5.1; 2.3.9; 3.3.2; 3.4.1.

unexpected outcome from the widespread publication of his wife's beauty. These anxieties of the character Dionysius about how his story will end also reflect the dilemma of the author himself at this point: How will Chariton bring his own story from this point to the end he had anticipated when he began? An end that will involve paradoxical recognitions and reversals. How, in other words, is he going to exert control over this powerful φήμη of Callirhoe? The explicit evocation of "ancient stories" (παλαιῶν διηγημάτων) and the way they end parallels the dilemma of the author as he searches for an appropriate way to bring this story to its proper end.

Another important form of mortar is the use of explicit allusions, of which we have two here: the first is to the *Odyssey*, implicitly comparing the heroine to Penelope, hinting at a possible shape for the story; and indeed an *Odyssey*-like scenario develops later in the novel insofar as there is a competition for the heroine and insofar as the *Odyssey*'s reunion of separated spouses is a common novel plot trajectory. The second allusion to Menander refers to one of the most important sources of forms of closure for the ancient novel: New Comedy; and Chariton's ending indeed recalls many traditional motifs from that genre. Yet here this single line ("when he could be in bed embracing his beloved") is from the opening of Menander's *Misoumenos*, so that we have a reference both to a generic form of closure (New Comedy) and a particular opening gambit, a kind of second beginning.[9]

In this connection the statement that the "account of the trial (τὸ τῆς δίκης διήγημα) made Callirhoe more celebrated" is pertinent. Goold renders τὸ τῆς δίκης διήγημα as "talk of the trial," which makes good sense because the trial hasn't taken place yet, so this διήγημα is just anticipatory. But διήγημα is the regular word not for such anticipatory talk, but for a narrative account told from the perspective of its outcome, as in the expression παλαιῶν διηγημάτων a few lines later for the "ancient stories" of women's changes; indeed the verb διηγήσομαι occurs in the first sentence of the novel describing the author's own activity as a narrator: "I am going to tell you a story of erotic suffering," and again in book 5.1.2 when he begins the second half. The account of the trial will indeed, once it

[9] New Comedy motifs also appear in the early scenes of the novel, especially the frame-up scene (1.4) where Menander is quoted twice. At 1.1.14 Penelope is also invoked as a comparanda of Callirhoe by an allusion to *Od.* 4.703.

takes place in book 5, increase Callirhoe's celebrity, but that is something that Chariton is only anticipating at this point. In a poetics account, in which everything is presumed to be always already composed, this might be called an instance of foreshadowing, looking forward to what one knows will be coming; but from a prosaics perspective, this prolepsis is indicative of the author's effort to knit together the two halves of the novel by weaving a connection between the φήμη of Callirhoe and the story of the trial he is now preparing to begin to narrate.

Another noteworthy characteristic of this passage is the profusion of comparative adjectives: Eros, we are told, was dispatching an expedition more celebrated (ἐνδοξότερον), more conspicuous (ἐπιφανέστερον), more regal (βασιλικώτερον). Talk of the trial made Callirhoe's fame more celebrated (ἐνδοξοτέραν); yet the woman herself was greater (κρείττων) than rumor had made her out to be. Meanwhile, Dionysius is more fretful (δειλότερον) and regretted being more hasty (προπετέστερον). Conte notes that proems in the middle frequently register a change of subject matter as a change to some higher or greater or more important subject matter, as in the proem of book 7 of the *Aeneid*,[10] and this series of comparative adjectives has a similar effect of reinvoking a sense of beginning again, of a renewed and more vigorous push forward to the end. The second half of Chariton's novel does in fact have a trial and a war and other manly things which focus more attention on the public sphere in which the hero Chaereas will become more prominent than the heroine Callirhoe. This redirection of the narrative is being articulated in this medial passage, where the particular path the narrative will take from this point on is being formulated more concretely for the first time. It is worth noting in this connection the view of Brigitte Egger that the novel seems divided against itself in its treatment of Callirhoe: on the one hand, Chariton foregrounds the potent eroticism of Callirhoe that overwhelms all men who see her, and hence makes her a powerful agent in the story in a novel way; simultaneously, however, Chariton evokes traditional restrictions on femininity that would put Callirhoe in her 'proper' place.[11] I would observe that although the novel ends on the latter note, it is the other

[10] Conte (1992) 152.
[11] Egger (1994).

element that has driven the narrative forward up to its midpoint, so that this caesura also marks a retreat into greater conventionality.

The last thing I want to talk about in this passage is the summary that begins book 5. As a narrative event, summary is a place where the forward movement of the text is halted, and units that have been already presented are surveyed, generally with an aim of taking stock of them in some way, especially to bestow on them some meaning greater than the sum of the parts. A summary occurs at a moment where for some reason it no longer seemed possible to ‘let the events speak for themselves’. Indeed, since the beginning paragraphs, Chariton’s novel has made little effort to produce a sense of narrative totality. But here at the middle, something made the author feel that it was necessary to produce such a summary. What does the author see when he surveys what has happened so far? As far as I can tell, there is only one aspect of plot-shaping at this point: the statement that “Aphrodite had engineered the marriage” (πολιτευσαμένης ’Αφροδίτης τὸν γάμον) of the protagonists, for this is the first time that Aphrodite is mentioned in that role. But this is picked up in another summary at the beginning of book 8, where we are told that Aphrodite was punishing Chaereas like Poseidon punished Odysseus (8.1.2-3). That here in book 5 this mention of Aphrodite is an instance of explicit plot-shaping and revision is evidenced by the fact that till now Eros, not Aphrodite, has been identified as the one who engineered the marriage and was toying with the lovers’ plight – indeed Eros is so identified at the end of book four (4.7.5). But from now on Chaereas is to be cast as a more central figure, becoming a kind of Odysseus-like sufferer, for whom Aphrodite seems more appropriate as an “angry god”; whereas Eros, who is φιλόκαινος, the impish deity who, like fire, is “most light and unstable,” was a more appropriate guiding spirit for the more open-ended and ‘novel’ part of the story.

To summarize, thematization of agency, particularly references to composition or distribution, allusions to other genres or stories, particularly their outcomes, comparative adjectives that look forward to ‘some greater subject’, proleptic gestures, and summary: these are some of the mortar elements in this example.

Let me turn now to Longus’ *Daphnis and Chloe*. This novel begins with a proem containing a description of a painted scene in a lovely grove observed by our author while he is hunting on the island

of Lesbos, who then writes the story we read based on these paintings. The painted scene is a kind of preliminary outline of the novel, presenting a handful of events all of which take place in the first half of this novel of four books. As such, it puts forth in a general way the shape of the story by pointing to its New Comedy conclusion, with the recognition of the foundlings, and enumerates several of the episodes of the first half of the story. The proem represents the kind of material that it would be necessary to have in hand to begin composing a novel story: a beginning and end, some initial episodes, with the rest to be fleshed later. The final episode of Book 2 is the last event mentioned in the proem (the oaths of the two young lovers: νέοι συντιθέμενοι). The beginning of Book 3, the midpoint of the novel, has an interesting mixture of elements of closure and opening; indeed it is much like a second beginning in the middle.

The book opens with a strange incident in which the two main cities of Lesbos are suddenly brought to a state of war by an incident that had occurred earlier in the story. The war that breaks out in the first paragraph is aborted in the next one, literally coming from and going nowhere. This brief war episode, with its "unexpected beginning and end" (3.3.1: ἀδόκητον ἀρχὴν καὶ τέλος) with no middle in between, is a reverse image of most novels, which typically have a generic and expected beginning and end, between which there is an indefinite and indeterminate middle. This unusual episode thematizes narrative organization, especially focusing on proper beginnings and endings. This thematization is continued in the next paragraph, when the arrival of winter closes off all narrative possibility: a sudden snowfall blocks all the roads and locks all the farmers in their homes, compelling Daphnis and Chloe to wait for spring as if a rebirth from death (3.4.2: ἐκ θανάτου παλιγγενεσίαν). It is as though our author, having completed the episodes of the story identified in the prologue, is now preparing to launch off on a new path that was less fixed when he began, and is now mustering narrative resources for that effort by focusing on the problems of beginning and ending, and by gesturing toward the promise of full meaning.

The next paragraph switches into the mode of description, detailing the character of a lovely arboreal cave nearby, which reminds us of the grove at the beginning of the story where the hunter/author encountered the picture that stimulated him to write the novel. It is in this arbor that Daphnis now contrives to see Chloe by going there on

a hunting expedition. Although it is a good distance away, "for love," we are told, "every way is passable (πάντα βάσιμα) even through fire, water and snow," a common enough sentiment in erotic literature, but also one that resonates with the textual dilemma of coming up with a path to continue the story, of getting through this narrative obstacle. When no one comes out of Chloe's house spontaneously, there is an amusing monologue in which Daphnis imagines various scenarios to explain his appearance there, each paired with an imagined response from Chloe's father (3.6.3):

> "I've come to get a light for a fire."
> "Weren't there neighbors close by?"
> "I've come to ask for bread."
> "But your bag's full of food."
> "A wolf chased me."
> "And where are his footprints?"

The authorial dilemma of what to narrate next seems to be reflected in Daphnis's dilemma about what to do next, about how to present himself to the adult world in order to achieve his desires. In this novel, we readers have been invited all along to adopt the sophisticated perspective of the author, who finds humor and pleasure in the exaggerated innocence and ignorance of the two children; now Daphnis becomes assimilated to that same perspective as he becomes a hunter, like the author at the beginning of the story, and takes action to move the story along, eventually achieving sexual knowledge superior to Chloe from an older woman, and then becoming a suitor of Chloe.

At the same time, Chloe's passivity is emphasized in this section: without resource (ἄπορος καὶ ἀμήχανος) she sits at home learning domestic activities and listening to talk about marriage from her stepmother.[12] Indeed, as David Konstan has shown, critical to the thematics of the second half of the story is the asymmetry of the children's experiences as Daphnis becomes a suitor among other suitors:

> The plot veers away from occasions of sexual frustration for the young couple and takes up the rivalry among suitors for the hand of

[12] 3.4.5: ἡ δοκοῦσα μήτηρ, literally her 'apparent mother': a reference to the end which will involve finding Chloe's true parents.

> Chloe, as though the problem of postponed gratification were now forgotten, or subsumed under the competition to acquire a spouse.[13]

Konstan notes that there is a dissonance within this text, a double perspective on sexuality that simultaneously construes marriage as the culmination of adolescent sexual experimentation, but also leaves room for an alternative, utopian image of sexuality that is not simply the prelude to phallic penetration. This dissonance results in a kind of textual amnesia in the second half about certain critical issues from the first half. This reorientation is signaled in the opening chapters of Book 3 and is rationalized by a kind of textual logic involving a series of comparative adjectives. Remember that proems in the middle frequently register a change of subject matter as a change to some higher or greater or more important subject matter:

3.2.3: The Methymneans regretted acting *more impetuously* (ὀξύτερα) rather than *more moderately* (σωφρονέστερα).
3.2.5: the Mytileneans found peace *more profitable* (κερδαλεωτέραν) than war.
3.3.1: to Daphnis and Chloe war was *less bitter* (πικρότερος) than winter.
3.4.1: to the farmers winter was *sweeter* (γλυκύτερον) than spring itself.
3.4.2: Daphnis and Chloe await spring as if resurrection from death.
3.4.5: Daphnis is *cleverer* (συνετώτερος) than a girl.

This series of comparisons seems to be a sort of pseudo-syllogistic movement that begins with an opposition of moderation[14] and spontaneity, moves from war and peace, winter and spring, ending with the conclusion that Daphnis is more clever than Chloe: not a logical conclusion, but a textual conclusion. These comparisons introduce for the first time in the novel a differentiation of adult desire from that of the protagonist children, signaling the change of focus of which Konstan speaks.

---

[13] Konstan (1994) 88.

[14] 'Moderation' (σωφροσύνη) is a key term from the proem differentiating the author from his characters, for the proem ends with the words: "May the god Eros let me write about the passions of others but keep my own self-control (ἡμῖν ... σωφρονοῦσι)," so this reference to σωφροσύνη is another link to the proem.

Moreover, I would assert that the comparison of winter and spring to death and resurrection thematizes the issue of a second beginning for the story. And this is given some support from the fact that there is a textual problem in this very phrase. For the words translated as "they awaited spring as though a resurrection" is not in any of the manuscripts, but is an emendation. The manuscripts do not have a word for 'spring' but a series of variations on the noun εἰρήνης, 'peace'. Here is the text of Dalmeyda (1934) along with his apparatus (3.4.2):

τὴν ἠρινὴν ὥραν ἀνέμενον ἐκ θανάτου παλιγγενεσίαν

τὴν ἠρινὴν ὥραν Walckenauer; τὴν ὥραν τῆς εἰρήνης A; τὴν εἰρήνης ὥραν $V_1V_2P_2$ [in marg. V_1 ἴσως εἰαρινήν; supersc. in V_2 ἴσως εἰαρινῆς]; τὴν εἰρινὴν ὥραν V_3P_1

The word for 'peace' (εἰρήνη) and the adjectives meaning 'spring-like' (ἠρινὴν or εἰαρινήν) are very close, but the earliest readings are τὴν ὥραν τῆς εἰρήνης and τὴν εἰρήνης ὥραν: both could be translated "they waited during this season of peace for a resurrection from the dead." Marginal notes suggest various sensible corrections, but it is a little hard to explain how the word for 'peace' ever entered this context, since it is the *lectio difficilior*. Just as later copyists and editors have thought 'spring' to make better sense than 'peace', at an earlier stage, someone—maybe Longus, maybe someone else—thought the word 'peace' made better sense here.

Here is a place where it is necessary to pay closer attention to the interplay between thematic elements (bricks) and text-economic elements (mortar). My preliminary comparison of composing a discourse to building a wall of bricks and mortar is actually a little misleading. In a prose discourse, as opposed to a performed discourse, everything is just words, so when we identify something as mortar as opposed to bricks, this is over simple. Actually we should speak of an individual textual element as a locus for the play of forces, and hence something that can function either as brick or as mortar, or as both. A better analogy for a prose text might be a woven rug, in which every strand is simultaneously part of the design that is represented, but also exerts a force that holds the whole rug together. In the passage at hand, the word translated either as 'spring' or 'peace' plays such a double role. In terms of the thematics of the passage, the

idea of ‘spring’ resonates well with the idea of resurrection.[15] But in terms of the organizational economy of the text, a combination of the ideas of spring and peace is appropriate to this second beginning in the middle. As a hinge between the two halves of the novel, this point is simultaneously an opening and closing, a new beginning, like spring, and also a relaxation of tension, a closure of sorts, like peace. It is a moment of focus on how to start over and also how to achieve an ‘expected end’. To choose one of the two readings, as editors and translators must do, is to reduce this doubleness, that is to me emblematic of the ancient novel: heuristic and experimental in posing new and interesting scenarios; often conventional in giving the usual ‘expected’ answers. Like Chariton’s *Callirhoe*, Longus’ novel starts out with something ingenious and remarkable, only to redirect itself towards a rather unremarkable ‘happy ending’. That shift could be the result of indolence, or it could be something intended from the start as an ideological act, or it could be the result of mixed motives. No matter which, a critical part of reading these novels is to follow these shifts in discursive mode, these revisionist moments, that signal an evolving logic that is heterogeneous both in its purposes and in its effects.

[15] See especially Chalk (1960).

This page intentionally left blank

LA LETTRE DANS LE ROMAN GREC OU LES LIAISONS DANGEREUSES

Françoise Létoublon

Si les correspondances grecques et les romans épistolaires à proprement parler ont été bien étudiés, en particulier par Stowers (1986), Holzberg (1994)[1] et par Rosenmeyer (2001), il me semble que le rôle et la typologie des lettres dans les romans grecs non épistolaires n'ont pas encore reçu une attention suffisante, sauf dans les ouvrages de Hägg (1971) et Fusillo (1991) 88-97. Je reprends ici ce corpus[2] d'une manière méthodique en m'inspirant à la fois de la linguistique pour les formes du genre épistolaire et de la narratologie pour leur mise en œuvre dans le genre romanesque.

Deux principaux modèles épistolaires seront analysés spécifiquement: celui de la lettre 'officielle' qui donne une information ou un ordre et celui de la lettre d'amour. En général, les lettres du premier modèle arrivent correctement à leur destinataire, tandis que celles du deuxième type subissent dans les romans du corpus étudié divers avatars qui jouent un rôle important dans la dramatisation de l'action romanesque: les lettres d'amour sont interceptées, remises à quelqu'un d'autre que leur destinataire, ou lues par une tierce personne après que le destinataire les ait reçues, ce qui entraîne toute une chaîne d'événements imprévus, et met gravement en danger les protagonistes en faisant rebondir l'action: c'est ce qui nous permet d'utiliser le titre du roman épistolaire de Laclos pour l'appliquer à l'ensemble de la correspondance amoureuse dans les romans grecs.

Cette recherche vise indirectement à montrer comment le roman grec est l'une des sources principales du roman européen à l'époque baroque et classique, à partir de la diffusion des grandes traductions qui ont suivi celles des *Ethiopiques* et de *Daphnis et Chloé* par Amyot, y compris des grands romans épistolaires des Scudéry au XVIIe siècle, puis de Prévost, Laclos, Rousseau et Crébillon au XVIIIe, pour nous limiter à la tradition française du genre.

---

[1] Voir aussi son article sur Chion (Holzberg [1996d]) et l'abondante bibliographie donnée dans Schmeling (ed.) (1996).

[2] Sont pris en compte systématiquement *Chairéas et Callirhoé*, *Les Ephésiaques*, *Les Ethiopiques*, *Leucippé et Clitophon*.

La correspondance comme phénomène linguistique et comme genre

Une lettre est un texte écrit qui a toutes les formes du discours: elle commence en principe par une forme d'adresse, et se caractérise par les pronoms, les temps, les adverbes etc. du discours oral direct, tout ce que les linguistes regroupent sous le terme de *déictique*; la seule différence habituelle avec un discours direct est qu'en grec, au lieu des termes d'adresse habituelle au vocatif, on trouve en général au début un nominatif renvoyant à l'auteur de la lettre, et un datif renvoyant à son destinataire, avec une formule de salut telle χαίρειν (s.e. λέγει). La formule de clôture aussi peut présenter des particularités qui différencient une lettre d'un simple discours mis par écrit, comme une sorte de rituel social particulier.

En fait, ce discours est fait pour être lu par son destinataire. À la différence du texte littéraire noté par écrit ou de l'inscription officielle, la lettre est en somme un discours direct que sa conservation par écrit permet de différer dans le temps, et comme ce discours direct, elle va d'un émetteur en principe unique à un récepteur ou destinataire lui aussi unique: c'est une forme de communication interpersonnelle. Le délai temporel est un élément capital du phénomène: dans l'Antiquité, ce délai est bien supérieur aux habitudes modernes, mais encore de nos jours, un retard dans la transmission peut entraîner des effets irréparables – l'usage du courrier électronique nous le fait sentir de manière encore plus vive.

L'importance des lettres dans les romans grecs[3] fait partie de leurs traits topiques, tout d'abord en tant que moyen de communication entre les personnages, ce qui me semble relever du réalisme romanesque, de la *mimésis* du genre; constatant l'importance de l'information qui circule par courrier dans la vie de leur temps, les romanciers reproduisent fidèlement des lettres de ce type, au point que l'on peut parfois se demander à la vue de certaines lettres et de certains textes littéraires réputés romanesques s'ils ne sont pas classés à tort dans un genre plutôt que dans l'autre – mais je laisserai le problème de Chion de côté ici. La forme de la lettre est à peu près fixée dans l'usage suivant les normes énoncées, mais dans les romans, l'insertion des lettres jouit d'une liberté à peu près analogue à celle du discours direct: reproduites telles qu'elles sont censées avoir

[3] Voir Fusillo (1991) sur l'histoire de la fiction épistolaire.

été écrites, au discours direct, reproduites au discours direct, mais avec des abréviations, par exemple omission des termes d'adresse et de salut, synthétisées au discours indirect ou encore présentes d'une manière allusive seulement.

Dans les romans grecs, les lettres sont désignées essentiellement par deux termes, ἐπιστολή et γράμματα, susceptibles de se rencontrer dans le même contexte comme de simples variantes stylistiques, et dans certains cas par le nom de la "tablette", support de l'écriture, δέλτος, mais il s'agit dans les *Ethiopiques* d'un cas très spécifique où l'on peut supposer une allusion aux termes utilisés par Euripide dans son *Hippolyte*.[4] La forme étant à peu près fixée suivant les remarques qui précèdent, mais exploitée dans les romans avec une relative liberté, nous chercherons un autre élément de classement typologique dans la fonction de la lettre: dans certains cas purement informative, destinée à transmettre un ordre ou une demande, elle dépend largement du rapport hiérarchique entre l'émetteur et le récepteur; dans d'autres cas, correspondant à une relation affective et non purement sociale, elle est destinée davantage à établir ou rétablir la communication entre des personnes éloignées qu'à une simple information factuelle. Il y a évidemment des cas intermédiaires ou mixtes.

La lettre informative

Un exemple canonique de la lettre d'information me semble être celui de la lettre reçue de Byzance par Hippias, le père du héros, dans *Leucippé et Clitophon* 1.3.5-6 "Sostratos salue son frère Hippias. Ma fille Leucippé et ma femme Panthée arrivent auprès de toi, car une guerre …"[5]

Nom de l'émetteur au nominatif, forme initiale de salut, pas de formule finale: peut-être cette omission s'explique-t-elle par la brièveté du message ou par la situation d'urgence dans laquelle Sostratos écrit: effectivement, la lettre arrive juste à temps pour que la famille se précipite au port accueillir les cousines de Byzance annoncées dans la lettre.

[4] Alaux, Létoublon (1998).
[5] La traduction est de moi.

Un passage des *Ephésiaques* 5.2-3 montre comment le fait de ne recevoir aucune lettre, aucune information donc, peut être interprété comme un signe de mort. Le retard, ne serait-ce que d'un jour, dans la transmission, a des conséquences funestes, un passage de *Leucippé et Clitophon* le montre, 5.10.3: une lettre est arrivée un jour trop tard pour résoudre les problèmes dans lesquels se débattent les personnages.

Les informations dont il s'agit dans ce type de lettres sont d'ordre familial et privé, sans que la relation amoureuse soit concernée sinon de manière indirecte. À ce type de lettre appartient la tablette trouvée sur le cadavre de Thisbé à l'entrée de la caverne des Pâtres de Bessa dans les *Éthiopiques*, 2.10. Que cette tablette-testament ait été prévue comme une véritable lettre, d'une vivante à un vivant, le contenu en témoigne explicitement. Thisbé, ayant aperçu Cnémon, a voulu par ce moyen lui expliquer la partie de leur histoire qui lui restait obscure, elle complète ainsi une partie du 'roman de Cnémon', qui va pouvoir se résoudre par son mariage avec Nausiclée et son départ pour la Grèce.[6] Sa valeur de legs lui vient du hasard qui a fait périr l'auteur de la lettre—ironiquement d'ailleurs à la place de l'héroïne, Chariclée—avec la lettre encore sur elle. Le rapprochement entre cette lettre devenue involontairement un testament et la bande de tissu brodée par Persinna comme objet de reconnaissance[7] pour Chariclée est intéressant parce qu'il s'agit presque de la situation inverse: Persinna a écrit cette lettre, difficile à déchiffrer puisqu'en hiéroglyphes alors que la tablette de Thisbé est parfaitement lisible pour les Grecs qui la découvrent, à la fois comme un testament et une justification pour le cas où elle viendrait à mourir et comme un linceul funéraire pour le cas où l'enfant mourrait la première. Toutes les deux ayant survécu, et la connaissance des hiéroglyphes par Calasiris ayant permis le déchiffrement, la bandelette brodée a seulement à jouer le rôle moins dramatique de lettre et de *symbolon*. Et dans ce cas, toutes les fonctions de la bandelette sont soigneusement prévues et explicitées dans le texte même par son auteur.

Dans les romans, la plupart des lettres à fonction informative ont en fait un caractère officiel, et témoignent du haut degré de développement de la communication dans l'empire perse, dans les *Ethiopiques* et dans *Chairéas et Callirhoé.*

---

[6] Voir Morgan (1982) et Létoublon (1993) 94-5.
[7] Voir Létoublon (1993) 159-60, 196-7.

Dans *Chairéas et Callirhoé* les lettres envoyées d'Ionie à Babylone pour informer le Grand Roi de ce qui se passe à Milet autour de Callirhoé, épouse de Dionysios, arrivent toutes à destination et remplissent leur office, car Artaxerxès réagit en convoquant, par courrier, tout le monde à Babylone; 4.6.8, il envoie deux messages à la fois, à Pharnace et à Mithridate:[8]

> il écrivit ainsi d'une part à Pharnace: "Envoie-moi Dionysios de Milet, mon esclave," et d'autre part à Mithridate: "Viens te défendre d'avoir formé un complot contre le ménage de Dionysios."

Ici, on remarque que les messages sont très courts et semblent incomplets, manquant des formules rituelles, soit parce qu'ils sont portés par un messager officiel et que le Grand Roi n'a pas à se nommer lui-même comme le font les personnages privés dans leurs lettres, soit parce que le narrateur fait l'ellipse des formes d'adresse habituelles, obtenant par la condensation du texte au discours direct comme du récit, un effet de dramatisation tout à fait concerté et efficace, préparant le *drama* du procès qui va se dérouler à B abylone.

Dans *les Éthiopiques*, on a de nombreux exemples de ce type d'échanges épistolaires, avec certaines lettres citées au discours direct d'une manière très ample, probablement dans un esprit mimétique: à la couleur locale perse dans l'empire d'Artaxerxès tel que le montre Chariton vient s'ajouter ici l'exercice de la puissance perse en pays égyptien, avec une sauvagerie (celle du personnage d'Arsacé en particulier) peut-être exacerbée par l'effet de domination étrangère.

Ethiopiques 5.9, Mitranès écrit au satrape Oroondatès pour l'informer de la belle prise qu'il vient de faire en la personne de Théagène, la lettre devant d'ailleurs voyager avec le prisonnier, et subir les mêmes aléas que lui:

> La lettre contenait ces instructions: "À Oroondatès, satrape, Mitranès, son lieutenant. Voici un jeune Grec que j'ai fait prisonnier. Il est trop beau pour mon service et mérite de servir seulement notre Grand Roi et d'être vu par lui seul. Je te laisse l'honneur d'offrir à notre maître un présent su précieux et si magnifique que la cour royale n'en a jamais vu et n'en verra plus jamais."

Au livre 8.3, Oroondatès a appris l'indignité de la conduite de sa femme, et il lui écrit une lettre lui ordonnant d'envoyer ses deux

[8] On retrouvera ces échanges situés dans leur contexte dramatisé plus loin.

prisonniers, Théagène et Chariclée, pour qu'ils soient remis au Roi, et il écrit aussi à Euphratès, le chef des eunuques du palais, pour s'assurer de l'obéissance d'Arsacé. On reparlera de ces deux lettres un peu plus loin, car celle qui était destinée à Arsacé ne lui sera pas remise. Au moment où le roman s'approche du dénouement, des messages informatifs officiels sont aussi transmis dans le royaume d'Éthiopie: 10.1.3-10.2.2, le roi Hydaspe écrit aux Gymnosophistes et à la reine Persinna pour les informer de sa victoire et des sacrifices au Soleil et à la Lune qui sont prévus, au cours desquels les prisonniers doivent périr sur le bûcher.

Enfin, une fois l'heureux dénouement atteint avec une scène d'*anagnorisis* digne du théâtre classique, Hydaspe reçoit les ambassades étrangères et les félicitations pour sa victoire au siège de Syené, et parmi les ambassades, en 10.34.1-5, arrive une lettre d'Oroondatès qui fait rebondir la situation: Chariclée cherchait à se faire reconnaître de ses parents en Éthiopie, le satrape d'Égypte vaincu fait par sa lettre surgir un père à la recherche de sa fille. Hydaspe lui fait voir toutes les filles grecques disponibles, sauf bien sûr Chariclée qu'il vient lui-même de reconnaître pour sa fille. D'une fille sans père au début du roman, nous avons cette fois ironiquement trop de pères revendiquant la paternité de Chariclée…

Dans deux exemples, l'un dans *les Éthiopiques* 3.18, l'autre dans *Chairéas et Callirhoé*, 5.2.2, on voit que le message officiel peut n'être pas écrit et pourvu du sceau officiel, mais transmis oralement par un messager comparable à ceux d'Homère,[9] à moins que l'effet de message oral ne soit dû à une ellipse du texte; en tout cas, nous considérerons ces exemples comme des variantes du type habituel de la lettre informative officielle.

Les lettres à caractère informatif et les lettres d'ordre et de requête sont nombreuses dans nos romans, mais ce n'est pas en elles que réside à mon sens la spécificité du roman et l'attente du lecteur. Sans prétendre spéculer sur les attentes des lecteurs antiques des romans, nous pouvons un peu juger de ces attentes d'après nos propres réactions et d'après celles des lecteurs du temps passé, d'après les échos que l'on peut trouver des romans grecs dans le roman français au moins, depuis le temps de traductions d'Amyot jusqu'à la fin du XVIIIème siècle. Cette spécificité, c'est la lettre d'amour.

---

[9] Voir Létoublon (1987).

La lettre d'amour

Une lettre peut-elle forcer à aimer?

Le roman de Xénophon d'Ephèse, dont le style est peu élaboré, montre un exemple intéressant de la lettre d'amour: Habrocomès et Anthia sont tous deux prisonniers du puissant brigand installé à Tyr, Apsyrtos, et sa fille Manto s'éprend d'Habrocomès. Elle tente de soudoyer la servante Rhodé, mais Habrocomès résiste à toutes les propositions. Finalement Manto (2.5)

> n'y tient plus et écrit à Habrocomès la lettre suivante: "Bel Habrocomès, ta maîtresse te salue. C'est Manto qui t'écrit: je t'aime et je suis à bout de forces. Sans doute est-ce messéant à une jeune fille, mais l'amour m'y contraint. Je t'en prie, ne me dédaigne pas, ne fais pas affront à celle qui veut ton bien. Si tu veux m'écouter, je persuaderai mon père Apsyrtos de m'unir à toi: nous nous débarrasserons de celle qui est aujourd'hui ta femme et tu seras riche et heureux. Mais si tu refuses, songe à ce qui t'attend, car celle que tu auras outragée saura se venger de toi et aussi de tes compagnons, conseillers de tes mépris."

Le caractère inhabituel, et même inconvenant (ἀπρεπές) de la lettre est explicité par son auteur elle-même: le lecteur doit donc lui aussi, suivant les instructions contenues dans le texte, trouver ce message inconvenant et choquant. C'est en tout cas la réaction aussi du destinataire, Habrocomès, que la lettre cherchait à attirer, avec un qualificatif flatteur accompagnant le terme d'adresse.[10] Mais ensuite, le ton de Manto change, elle parle en 'maîtresse' (δέσποινα) à un esclave, présentant une alternative menaçante, avec le ton de supériorité hiérarchique qui était de mise dans les lettres officielles du type précédent et mentionnant le pouvoir de son père. Quand on connaît le roman des *Ephésiaques*, suite de *topoi* sans originalité, même sans disposer d'autres exemples de lettres écrites par une femme barbare pour dévoiler son amour et ses moyens de chantage à celui qu'elle aime et tient en son pouvoir, on peut au moins supposer qu'il s'agit d'un *topos* de la lettre d'amour: Arsacé aurait pu en écrire une analogue à Théagène, ou Mélité à Clitophon. Bien sûr, Habrocomès, in-

[10] "Au bel Habrocomès," Ἁβροκόμῃ τῷ καλῷ: depuis le début du roman, la beauté d'Habrocomès est mise constamment en avant autant que celle d'Anthia, et l'épithète est à peu près aussi répétitive qu'une épithète homérique formulaire: voir sur Xénophon et les formules O'Sullivan (1995).

capable d'aimer une autre qu'Anthia et tout aussi incapable de déguiser ses pensées, réagit de manière totalement négative. Et sa réponse (2.5.4), dans une rhétorique d'école que l'on pourrait comparer à des exemples donnés par les rhéteurs est conforme à cette réaction:

> Il garde la tablette et sur une autre, qu'il remet à la servante, il répond: "Maîtresse, fais à ta volonté: je suis ton esclave. Traite-moi comme il te plaît. Si tu veux me tuer, je suis prêt; si tu veux me torturer, torture-moi à ta guise: mais entrer dans ton lit, je n'y puis consentir, et je ne saurais t'obéir si tu l'exigeais."

L'effet obtenu est une terrible colère de Manto, et la suite de l'histoire semble reproduire un thème topique du folklore universel, attesté entre autres dans la littérature grecque par l'histoire de Bellérophon (*Iliade* VI) et par celle de Phèdre-Thésée-Hippolyte: l'amoureuse méprisée accuse le jeune homme qui lui résiste de lui avoir fait violence et persuade d'abord son père, qui expose Habrocomès au supplice, puis le fait mettre en prison, enchaîné. Ce qui me semble confirmer le statut topique de la lettre de Manto citée ci-dessus. Mais ensuite, c'est une nouvelle lettre d'elle, adressée à son père (2.12), qui déclenche la dernière péripétie de ce petit drame.

La vraie lettre d'amour, tentative de communication entre les deux héros

Le *topos* romanesque spécifique est celui de la lettre qui tente de rétablir la communication entre les héros séparés, de la lettre d'amour donc, sans menaces ni chantage tels que ceux de Manto. Les exemples, dans *Chairéas et Callirhoé* et *Leucippé et Clitophon*, montrent que les héros de roman, comme Habrocomès nous l'a déjà montré, ont suivi les leçons des rhéteurs et sophistes, et manient en virtuoses les figures, anaphore, asyndète, apostrophe, restriction de pensée...

Or les lettres échangées par les protagonistes, bien loin de remplir leur office attendu, établir ou rétablir le courant de communication entre les deux héros, provoquent dans les exemples rencontrés dans le roman grec un rebondissement de l'intrigue, précisément parce que l'objectif recherché, le rétablissement de la communication, se heurte à des obstacles et n'est pas atteint ou l'est imparfaitement: dans un cas la lettre, au lieu d'être remise à son destinataire, est remise à quelqu'un d'autre, et précisément à la personne au monde qui ne devait lire cette lettre à aucun prix, dans l'autre, elle parvient bien

à son destinataire mais elle est ensuite, par une méprise fatale, lue aussi par celui ou celle qui ne devait pas en avoir connaissance.[11]

Chez Chariton, Chairéas, après avoir échappé à la mise en croix sous l'autorité du satrape Mithridate, et après être devenu l'ami du satrape Mithridate, écrit une lettre à Callirhoé pour l'informer de sa situation, car elle le croit mort: habilement, le narrateur montre au lecteur le personnage écrivant sa lettre, puis, avec un coup de théâtre, le moment où elle est lue, avec une belle analyse des émotions des deux côtés. Mais tenons-nous en pour le moment à la lettre elle-même (*Chairéas et Callirhoé,* 4.4.7-10):

> "Chairéas à Callirhoé: je suis vivant grâce à Mithridate, mon sauveur et aussi, je veux l'espérer, le tien; j'ai été vendu pour la Carie par des Barbares, ceux-là même qui ont incendié la belle trière, la trière amirale, celle de ton père: Syracuse avait envoyé à son bord une délégation pour te chercher. En ce qui concerne l'ensemble de mes compagnons de voyage, je ne sais ce qu'ils sont devenus; quant à mon ami Polycharme et à moi, juste au moment où nous allions être mis à mort, la pitié de notre maître nous a sauvé la vie. Mithridate nous a comblés d'amabilités, mais il lui a suffi d'un seul geste pour me replonger dans l'affliction, son récit de ton mariage: la mort, puisque je suis un humain, je m'y attendais; mais ton mariage, je n'y avais pas pensé. Je t'en supplie, reviens sur ta décision. Tu vois sur cette lettre les larmes et les baisers que j'y répands. Je suis Chairéas, ton Chairéas, celui que tu as vu quand tu allais, jeune fille, au temple d'Aphrodite, Chairéas qui t'a fait passer des nuits blanches. Rappelle-toi la chambre nuptiale et la nuit de nos mystères, où pour la première fois tu as connu un homme et moi une femme. J'ai été jaloux? C'est bien là signe irréfutable d'affection. Je t'ai payé ma faute: j'ai été vendu, livré à l'esclavage, enchaîné. Ne va pas toujours m'en vouloir pour le coup de pied que je t'ai donné dans mon emportement: pour ma part, je suis monté sur la croix à cause de toi, sans rien te reprocher. Si seulement tu pensais encore à moi, mes souffrances ne seraient plus rien; si tu as d'autres sentiments, tu me rendras une sentence de mort."

Mithridate confie la lettre de Chairéas au plus sûr de ses serviteurs, Hygin, qui parle grec et doit donc être le meilleur intermédiaire, ce qui prouve bien qu'au moment d'envoyer la correspondance, on craint des mésaventures. Mais nous reparlerons plus loin des aléas rencontrés par cette lettre et de la dramatisation mise en œuvre par Chariton. Ce qui importe pour le moment, c'est que sa destinataire,

---

[11] D'où le choix du sous-titre *"La correspondance ou la liaison dangereuse"* (Létoublon [1993] chapitre 9,3): voir le rapprochement avec Laclos suggéré par Rousset (1986b) 83-94, "Merteuil et Valmont lecteurs indiscrets."

Callirhoé, ne la reçoit pas, mais qu'elle est lue par son mari, Dionysios, et que c'est la source de toutes les aventures ultérieures, jusqu'aux retrouvailles imprévues entre Callirhoé et Chairéas, devenu une sorte de héros national par sa transformation, inattendue en stratège habile et vainqueur digne de Thémistocle ou d'Hermocrate, le père que Callirhoé.

Chez Achille Tatius, c'est Leucippé qui prend l'initiative de la correspondance, et envoie à Clitophon chez Mélité une lettre destinée aussi à l'informer de son sort (elle aussi vit dans la dépendance de la même puissante Mélité, dans une maison de campagne et sous une fausse identité), un beau morceau de rhétorique garantissant qu'elle est restée vierge (5.18). Suivant les conventions du roman à la première personne, puisque c'est Clitophon qui raconte son histoire, nous n'avons pas ici le point de vue de l'émetteur, Leucippé. La lettre parvient à son destinataire, frappé de stupeur puisqu'il croyait Leucippé morte—comme Callirhoé croyait Chairéas mort dans l'exemple précédent—qui la lit au moment de la réception et la reproduit apparemment fidèlement au moment de la narration (5.18.1):

> Au milieu du festin, Satyros, me faisant signe, me demanda de me lever pour aller le voir; il avait un visage grave. Prenant comme prétexte qu'un mal de ventre me pressait, je me levai pour partir. Quand je fus près de lui, sans rien dire, il me tendit une lettre. En la prenant, avant même de la lire, je fus frappé de stupeur, car je reconnus l'écriture de Leucippé. Et voici ce qu'elle contenait: "Leucippé à Clitophon, mon maître. Car c'est ainsi que je dois t'appeler, puisque tu es le mari de ma maîtresse; Combien de maux j'ai subis par ta faute, tu le sais. Mais il est nécessaire que je te les rappelle. Par ta faute, j'ai quitté ma mère et choisi l'errance; par ta faute, j'ai subi un naufrage et fus prise par les brigands; par ta faute, je suis devenue une victime, et pour un sacrifice expiatoire, et je suis morte déjà deux fois; j'ai été vendue, j'ai été mise aux fers, j'ai porté le hoyau, j'ai pioché la terre, j'ai été fouettée […] Moi, j'ai tenu bon, au milieu de tant d'épreuves, mais toi, qui n'as pas été vendu, qui n'as pas été fouetté, tu te maries! […] Porte-toi bien, et jouis de tes nouvelles noces. Moi qui t'écris ces lignes, je suis encore vierge."

Clitophon répond (5.20) avec une rhétorique parallèle à celle de Leucippé, protestant de sa propre virginité "s'il y a une virginité masculine" dit-il lui-même.[12] Son fidèle serviteur, Satyros, est encore

[12] Et au moment où il écrit sa lettre, c'est d'ailleurs vrai, comme le personnage l'affirme devant l'ironie de son serviteur fidèle Satyros.

chargé de la transmission. Mais deux jours plus tard, le maladroit Clitophon, qui gardait constamment avec lui la lettre de Leucippé— preuve d'amour bien sûr—, la laisse tomber par mégarde et ne peut éviter que Mélité la ramasse et la lise: symétriquement à Dionysios lisant la lettre de son rival réputé mort, Mélité apprend que sa rivale auprès de Clitophon, qu'elle croyait morte, est bien vivante, et de surcroît, qu'elle lui donne elle-même abri dans sa propriété rurale (5.24.1). A la différence de Dionysios qui ne peut arriver chez Chariton à croire que Chairéas soit vivant, et bâtit tout un roman sur la traîtrise de Mithridate, Mélité, au vu des preuves, est sûre de la trahison et se donnera les moyens de mettre un terme à cette communication épistolaire, j'allais dire à ce roman par lettres.

La lettre comme élément de dramatisation du roman

Dans plusieurs cas dans les romans, les lettres sont lues à plusieurs reprises au cours du roman, et les romanciers tirent de ces diverses lectures des effets dramatiques étonnants.

Un effet de ce type se trouve même dans les *Ephésiaques*, pour moi un indice de plus allant contre la théorie de l'*épitomè*.[13] Apsyrtos trouve la lettre de Manto à Habrocomès et la lit, 2.10.1. Dans ce cas, la maladresse de Xénophon d'Éphèse empêche l'exploitation de l'effet de la seconde lecture que l'on pourrait imaginer: la lettre n'est pas citée expressément d'ailleurs. Mais la lettre retourne néanmoins la situation en faveur d'Habrocomès, puisqu'Apsyrtos reconnaît en la lisant son innocence et comprend les mensonges de sa fille. La maladresse même de Xénophon d'Ephèse fait comprendre la fonction d'une telle seconde lecture: le retournement de situation, ce qu'on appelle au théâtre une péripétie. Les autres romanciers grecs en montrent des exemples plus subtils et littérairement mieux développés.

Ainsi dans *les Ethiopiques* 7.24.2, Achaeménès, le fils de Cybèle, montre à Arsacé la lettre de Mitranès à Oroondatès, et il s'en faudra de peu qu'il n'obtienne par là Chariclée qu'il convoite ardemment; le discours indirect qui précède la production de la lettre montre bien l'habileté rhétorique qu'Héliodore prête à Achaeménès – Cybèle sa

---

[13] Voir l'analyse d'O'Sullivan (1995) 100-39, avec les autres possibilités d'interprétation.

mère, originaire de Lesbos, est elle-même une redoutable sophiste, et le nom d'Achaeménès même laisse supposer que son père est d'origine perse, ce qui lui donne aux yeux des Grecs tous les traits schématiques du Barbare. Le retournement de situation attendu de la lettre montrée à Arsacé se produit au moins provisoirement. Achaeménès est conforté dans son espoir, et par conséquent les deux héros encore plus profondément submergés par le malheur.

La deuxième lecture peut avoir une autre fonction, moins dramatique, mais importante pour la psychologie romanesque: il s'agit d'une relecture par le destinataire lui-même, cas de la lettre de Leucippé relue par Clitophon qui arrive difficilement à croire au bonheur que la lettre fait attendre (du moins avant son interception par Mélité): *Leucippé et Clitophon*, 5.19.5, Clitophon relit la lettre, décèle en particulier la qualité de l'*enargéia* du récit de Leucippé, il 'voit' les supplices dont la lettre lui parle comme s'il était présent, et il répond mentalement avant de se mettre à écrire sa réponse.

Cet exemple amène l'examen d'autres procédés de dramatisation permis par le phénomène de la lettre: après avoir imaginé sa lettre sans l'écrire, Clitophon doit en effet passer à l'acte et semble en proie au fantasme de la tablette vide, pour ne pas parler de la 'page blanche': il demande à Satyros de lui dicter sa réponse (5.20.4 "Mais que dois-je écrire? Dis-le moi") et celui-ci se moque de lui en disant que "c'est Eros qui [lui] dictera ce qu'[il] doit écrire," insistant après tout ce badinage retardateur sur l'urgence d'écrire cette lettre…

Héliodore montre d'autres exemples de variations sur la dramatisation possible à partir d'un simple message: au livre VIII des *Ethiopiques*, on se rappelle qu'Oroondatès a donné à l'eunuque Bagoas deux lettres, l'une pour Arsacé et l'autre pour Euphratès, le chef des eunuques de son palais à Memphis. Or la réception de la lettre s'écarte de nos attentes: 8.12.4, Bagoas va voir d'abord Euphratès, dans la nuit, celui-ci lit les deux lettres et non pas seulement celle qui lui est adressée, et il explique à Bagoas qu'il est inutile de transmettre celle qui était destinée à Arsacé. On aurait au moins pu s'attendre à une double lecture, par Euphratès et Arsacé, mais Héliodore, virtuose dans l'art de tromper les attentes du lecteur, fait que la lettre du satrape à son épouse ne sera même pas connue d'elle, proche de la mort certes, mais encore vivante au moment de l'arrivée de Bagoas au palais.

La tablette de Thisbé pour Cnémon montre un autre exemple de cette dramatisation, par ce que l'on pourrait appeler une lecture retardée, une attente redoublée de la clef de l'histoire: au livre II en effet, quand Cnémon la trouve, il ne peut pas lire immédiatement la tablette de Thisbé, clef de son histoire, parce que Théagène est trop pressé de retrouver Chariclée, qui l'appelle du fond de la caverne (2.6.1). La lecture ne pourra avoir lieu qu'un peu de temps plus tard (2.10), une fois Chariclée retrouvée, bien vivante, par Théagène accompagné de Cnémon, quand ils reviennent près du cadavre de Thisbé.

Au livre X, Héliodore tire encore un autre effet de la correspondance, celui de nous faire attendre avec les personnages des lettres dont l'écriture n'a pas été annoncée: les deux lettres d'Hydaspe aux Gymnosophistes et à Persinna en font attendre d'autres, annoncées par Sisimithrès à Persinna, et qui ne sont vues que du point de vue de la réception (10.4.1).

A mes yeux, le chef d'œuvre du roman grec reste bien *Les Ethiopiques.* Mais dans l'exploitation et la dramatisation du thème épistolaire, il me semble que c'est plutôt *Chairéas et Callirhoé*, avec un degré de répétition supérieur où je vois, paradoxalement peut-être, un indice de réussite littéraire: si j'ai bien compté, on trouve chez Chariton six lectures successives de la lettre de Chairéas à Callirhoé, et à ces diverses lectures de la même lettre spectaculaire s'ajoutent d'autres lettres qui provoquent divers rebondissements de l'intrigue.

Dans les autres romans, on a le plus souvent deux occurrences d'une lettre, l'une du point de vue de l'émetteur, le moment de l'écriture si l'on préfère, l'autre du point de vue du récepteur ou destinataire, moment de la lecture. Dans *Chairéas et Callirhoé*, l'histoire de la lettre de Chairéas à Callirhoé, outre son contenu par lui-même très dramatique puisqu'elle révèle qu'est vivant son mari qu'elle croyait mort et auquel elle a même fait construire un tombeau-mémorial, commence avant son écriture et se prolonge bien après sa première lecture par celui auquel elle n'était pas destinée: tout commence avec une idée de Mithridate qui pousse Chairéas à écrire une lettre à Callirhoé, ce qui rappelle un peu le passage de *Leucippé et Clitophon* dans lequel le héros demande à Satyros de l'aider à répondre à la lettre de Leucippé (4.4.5):

> "Ecris-lui un message: suscite en elle l'amertume et la joie, fais naître sa quête et son appel; je veillerai à la transmission de la lettre. Va

l'écrire."

Chairéas accepte la proposition; retiré, seul et tranquille dans un appartement il veut écrire, mais n'y arrive pas; des larmes coulent sans cesse et sa main tremble. Il pleure donc sur ses propres malheurs, puis commence à grand peine à écrire le message cité plus haut. Mithridate réapparaît pour s'occuper de la transmission, et ajoute d'ailleurs—sans le dire à Chairéas—un message personnel à Callirhoé, que le narrateur ne nous rapporte qu'au discours indirect (4.5.1). De son côté, Mithridate écrivit personnellement à Callirhoé, pour lui témoigner sa sympathie et sa sollicitude, en lui faisant savoir qu'il avait sauvé Chairéas à cause d'elle; il lui conseillait de ne pas se montrer cruelle pour son premier mari et lui promettait de manœuvrer lui-même pour les rendre l'un à l'autre, si toutefois elle lui signifiait son accord.

Le fidèle Hygin part avec les deux lettres. Malheureusement, une suite de contretemps imprévisibles rapportés en détail dans le roman, fait que la lettre, au lieu d'être remise à Callirhoé, est délivrée au maître de maison, son mari Dionysios, au milieu d'un banquet: il lit d'abord la lettre du stratège Bias qui a saisi les messages portés par Hygin, puis celle de Chairéas adressée à Callirhoé: l'émotion de Dionysios à sa lecture (4.5.8) rappelle celle de Calarisis au moment où il déchiffre la lettre-testament-bandelette funéraire brodée par Persinna:

> Puis il ordonna de rompre les sceaux et commença de lire les messages. Il vit: "A Callirhoé, Chairéas. Je suis vivant." *Alors se dérobèrent ses genoux et son cœur et la nuit se répandit sur ses yeux.* Mais malgré son évanouissement, il continuait de tenir fortement la lettre de peur que quelqu'un d'autre n'en prît connaissance.[14]

Bien que Dionysios ne puisse croire au contenu de la lettre, et continue à penser que Chairéas est mort, sa lecture constitue bien une *péripétie* dans le roman: il croit qu'il s'agit d'une manœuvre de Mithridate pour approcher Callirhoé, et la fait surveiller de très près. Les deux lettres, au lieu d'être communiquées à Callirhoé, leur unique destinataire, sont encore lues par quelqu'un d'autre, le puis-

[14] Je n'ai pas adopté constamment la traduction de G. Molinié, qui ne fait pas justice à la citation homérique (les deux formules de l '*Iliade* signalent chez Homère l'instant de la mort).

sant gouverneur de Lydie et d'Ionie, Pharnace, que Dionysios croit un ami sincère (4.6.2):

> Sur ces mots, il lui donna lecture des messages et lui raconta la machination. Pharnace prit plaisir à entendre ces propos, peut-être à cause de Mithridate (il y avait eu entre eux de nombreuses frictions du fait du voisinage de leur charge), mais plutôt à cause de son amour: lui aussi brûlait pour Callirhoé et c'est à cause d'elle qu'il faisait de si fréquents voyages à Milet, invitant à ses banquets Dionysios et sa femme.

Notons au passage que les deux lettres de Chairéas et de Mithridate ne sont ici rapportées qu'au discours indirect, et que Chariton souligne discrètement au passage que Dionysios, de manière presque inconsciente, transmet à Pharnace son interprétation erronée de la lettre de Chairéas, qu'il croit le produit d'une machination de Mithridate: le narrateur surinterprète alors les desseins de Pharnace en entrant dans sa psychologie d'amoureux. Le résultat est en tout cas que Pharnace écrit alors – en cachette de Dionysios comme Mithridate avait écrit à Callirhoé en cachette de Chairéas une 'lettre secrète' à Artaxerxès dénonçant Mithridate (4.6.3). Suivant le schéma habituel, la lettre de Pharnace est reçue par le Grand Roi, qui la lit dans une séance de délibération publique (4.6.5), mais elle n'est pas répétée dans le texte. Il envoie alors ses deux messages de convocation à Dionysios et à Mithridate (cf. supra), cités au moment de l'envoi, non au moment de leur réception. Mais les conséquences psychologiques chez les deux destinataires respectifs sont analysées avec grand soin, et mises en parallèle de manière très significative. L'intervention de Pharnace auprès du Grand Roi à Babylone a provoqué la convocation de tout ce monde dans la capitale de l'empire et le procès qui devra décider du sort des deux mariages de Callirhoé. En 5.4.3, dans les préparatifs du procès, les conséquences psychologiques de la lettre de Chairéas chez Dionysios et chez Mithridate sont à nouveau analysées.

Le procès commence enfin, avec les procédures ordinaires, sans d'ailleurs que Chariton semble avoir cherché une couleur locale orientale: on a l'impression de se trouver dans un procès pour affaire de mœurs en Grèce, avec les accusations et la rhétorique habituelle dans le genre de Lysias. Les témoignages sont produits et parmi ceux-ci intervient une lecture publique des lettres au procès des deux lettres de Pharnace et d'Artaxerxès (5.4.8).

Comme on le voit dans la citation, les deux lettres 'officielles' (celle de Pharnace était secrète, mais en tant que dénonciation auprès du Grand Roi, elle a pourtant un caractère officiel) sont citées au discours indirect. Tout cela a visiblement un but de la part de l'auteur, faire attendre la lettre d'amour: en 5.6.10, lecture est demandée par Dionysios—qui croit avoir là un argument majeur en sa faveur pour prouver la duplicité de Mithridate—de la lettre de Chairéas: la lecture publique de la lettre de Chairéas est rapportée sous la forme du discours direct, par les mêmes premiers mots que Dionysios avait eu le temps de lire avant son évanouissement homérique, "Χαιρέας ζῶ." "Moi, Chairéas, je suis vivant." On note que cette lecture publique en plein procès, devant la cour royale venue au spectacle, comporte aussi une spectatrice-actrice essentielle, Callirhoé: pour plusieurs personnages en cause, cette lettre est déjà bien connue, mais en principe, elle, la destinataire, ne la connaît pas: elle est venue à Babylone sans que Dionysios lui en ait révélé la raison et elle est censée continuer à croire que Chairéas est mort.[15] Si péripétie il y a au moment où le greffier lit la lettre de Chairéas qui doit servir à Dionysios d'argument, c'est donc pour Callirhoé avant tout. Le narrateur semble escamoter cet aspect, en insistant sur l'effet du discours de Dionysios vu comme un tout sur l'ensemble du public. Alors que la beauté de Callirhoé a fait se tourner vers elle tous les regards au moment de son entrée au tribunal, on ne trouve aucune mention de son attitude au moment où nous voudrions la voir rougir, pâlir, se troubler… Chariton a-t-il voulu laisser le lecteur imaginer la scène? S'agit-il d'une négligence? En tout cas, il donne immédiatement la parole à Mithridate, qui met en scène très intelligemment sa défense et les répliques que Dionysios pourrait lui opposer, puis lui redonne la parole, avant de susciter comme par la magie du verbe, en disant seulement "Chairéas, montre-toi, divin génie!" (5.7.10), son témoin, la personne même de Chairéas, celui qui a écrit le fameux "Χαιρέας ζῶ." La lecture de la lettre au tribunal est la dernière du roman,[16] et l'accueil que lui fait sa destinataire reste un mystère.

---

[15] Elle avait obtenu de Dionysios la permission de lui construire un tombeau à Milet et d'organiser une cérémonie de funérailles. Au moment de quitter les rivages ioniens, une des justifications explicites de sa tristesse est qu'elle doit quitter ce tombeau.

[16] Six occurrences en tout dont trois au discours direct, une seule réputée 'complète' bien sûr.

Mais cette lecture d'une lettre d'amour n'est pas la dernière lettre du roman de Chariton: après le procès, les héros ont encore bien des aventures à vivre, et pour revivre avec son épouse, Chairéas doit d'abord devenir un héros guerrier, vainqueur et magnanime, rendant au Roi Artaxerxès vaincu la Reine Statira, sa prisonnière, qui a été bonne à Babylone envers Callirhoé dont elle avait reçu la garde.

On a vu comment l'échange de lettres, qui risquent d'autant plus d'être interceptées qu'elles sont importantes pour les héros, est utilisé pour dramatiser les situations: les héros semblent constamment sur le point de se réunir pour vivre enfin un bonheur partagé, et constamment, la jalousie d'un tiers vient remettre en question cette sérénité et à plus tard le dénouement. La communication épistolaire entre amoureux exige le secret, et la topique romanesque interdit que ce secret soit préservé. Dans un cas pourtant, le dernier, c'est à l'insu de son véritable ami que l'héroïne écrit une lettre à l'habituel rival, renversant toutes les situations attendues. Tandis que Chairéas écrit au Grand Roi, Callirhoé profite du voyage de Statira pour lui confier une lettre destinée à Dionysios (8.4.1-7):

> Elle prit une petite tablette et y écrivit ces lignes: "Callirhoé salue Dionysios son bienfaiteur; tu es l'homme qui m'a libérée des brigands et de l'esclavage. Je te le demande, ne te mets nullement en colère: je suis de cœur avec toi par l'intermédiaire de notre fils à nous; je te le confie pour que tu le fasses élever et éduquer d'une façon digne de ses parents. N'essaie pas de lui donner une belle-mère, tu n'as pas uniquement un fils, tu as aussi une fille. C'est assez de deux enfants. Il faudra que tu les maries entre eux, quand il sera un homme; envoie-le alors à Syracuse, pour qu'il vienne voir son grand-père.[…] Adieu, généreux Dionysios, et n'oublie pas ta Callirhoé." Elle cacheta la lettre, la dissimula dans les plis de sa robe et [...] au moment de sortir du bateau, Callirhoé se prosterna légèrement devant Statira et lui donna en rougissant la lettre.

Cette lettre, unique secret de Callirhoé envers Chairéas, est une forme de mensonge, et elle ment aussi à son destinataire, en continuant à lui faire croire à sa paternité. Pieux mensonge sans doute, car Callirhoé explique à la reine Statira qu'elle craint le suicide de Dionysios.

Le vrai *topos* de la lettre dans le roman grec est celui de la lettre d'amour faisant communiquer les héros par écrit à défaut d'une communication directe. Comme les héros des romans grecs expri-

ment rarement leur amour par oral, la lettre d'amour est finalement le meilleur témoignage d'une analyse psychologique, sous forme autobiographique. Dans *Leucippé et Clitophon* qui adopte la forme autobiographique, le procédé permet un jeu intéressant: alors que le récit est censé reposer entièrement sur la vision rétrospective de sa propre histoire par le héros, les lettres citées livrent au lecteur des fragments de la vision qu'en avait Leucippé et qu'il en avait lui-même à un moment-clef de cette histoire. Et l'on s'aperçoit que dans l'intrigue, ces lettres d'amour topiques sont toujours 'interceptées', soit avant, soit après leur lecture par leur destinataire, et que toujours, l'intercepteur se trouve être précisément celui à qui cette correspondance devait rester cachée, à qui elle donne donc des moyens d'agir dans l'avenir, de faire rebondir l'intrigue. La lettre romanesque est un *topos* à la fois du point de vue de la connaissance psychologique des personnages et du point de vue de son rôle dans l'intrigue romanesque. L'utilisation massive et parfois hypertrophiée de ce procédé dans le roman par lettres au XVIIIe siècle le confirme.

On pourrait même dire que Laclos systématise en quelque sorte le *topos* de la lettre d'amour interceptée en faisant de deux de ses personnages, Valmont et Madame de Merteuil, les récepteurs et instigateurs de toute une correspondance qui ne leur est pas destinée,[17] les avatars modernes respectivement de Dionysios et de Mélité.

Substituts du dialogue oral, les lettres de roman sont aussi des fragments d'autobiographie, parfois mensongères comme l'autobiographie peut aussi l'être, la tablette de Thisbé pourrait en être un exemple. Les fonctions de la lettre sont diverses et ambiguës, la lettre brodée par Persinna pour sa fille en est probablement le meilleur exemple. Mais ce que Chariton montre avec une maestria superbe, c'est le rôle important qu'une lettre adressée par un être aimé à celui/celle qu'il/elle aime peut jouer dans les vicissitudes de la vie: annonçant que vit celui qui était cru mort, la lettre est lue par une multitude de gens qui essaient d'en tirer un profit personnel, de Mithridate à Pharnace, elle n'est pas connue de sa destinataire avant le moment où elle est lue en public au cours d'un procès, son auteur sort alors de l'ombre comme un fantôme.

[17] Voir sur ce point l'analyse pénétrante de Rousset (1986b) cité ci-dessus, n. 11.

THE ROLE OF INSCRIPTIONS IN GRECO-ROMAN NOVELS

Erkki Sironen

The role of inscriptions in Greco-Roman novels[1] on the whole and, especially from a narratological point of view, remains unassessed so far. Only five articles pertaining to inscriptions have come to my attention: three articles on inscriptions in Petronius,[2] one on the imperial cult in early 3rd century Tarsus in connection with the *Story of Apollonius King of Tyre*,[3] and finally one on riddles in bronze and stone, especially in connection with the *Alexander Romance*.[4] In contrast to this, the role of another type of written communication, namely letters incorporated in the novels, has not suffered from such neglect (see also Létoublon, in this volume).

The quoting of more or less fictitious inscriptions goes back to classical Greek historians, such as Herodotus (with around 30 examples),[5] Thucydides, Xenophon of Athens, etc. As for extended post-Hellenistic prose fiction, the importance of inscriptions may be evaluated, for example, through Lucian's *True Story*, which includes inscriptions 'authenticating' the travels of Heracles and Dionysus (1.7), a peace treaty (1.20) modeled on Thucydides, two inscriptions giving directions to certain shrines (1.32 and 2.3), and an epigram for Lucian (2.28), allegedly composed by Homer as an authentication that Lucian had really visited the Island of the Blest.[6] The *True Story*, as a comic exaggeration of travel literature, may indicate how important models such as Euhemerus' *Sacred Register* (the whole story supposedly cut on a pillar) and Antonius Diogenes' *Wonders Beyond Thule*—where the story is preserved on cypress tablets, as we learn

---

[1] In this paper novels with love as their main theme are called romances; the traditional names of the *Alexander Romance* and the *Aesop Romance*, however, were not changed.

[2] Pepe (1957), Bojadziev (1994-5), and Donahue (1999).

[3] Ziegler (1984).

[4] Stoneman (1995).

[5] For a comparatively recent study see West (1985).

[6] Note that there is only one letter (2.35) to balance these five inscriptions in the *True Story*.

from Hansen's article on authentication in this volume—may have been for Lucian.[7]

The following survey of the major Greco-Roman novels and of some of the 'fringe' shows that, while sometimes giving a touch of reality to the novels, the inscriptions play an integral part in the plots of only the so-called popular novels, namely *An Ephesian Tale* by Xenophon of Ephesus and the anonymous *Story of Apollonius King of Tyre*; e.g., Chariton's more high-brow *Chaereas and Callirhoe* does not feature any inscriptions. In both of the aforementioned popular works, inscriptions are mainly used as a key for recognizing persons and they are also given a decisive role in the reunion of persons that have been apart from each other for a long time. Because Xenophon's *Ephesian Tale* and the anonymous *Story of Apollonius King of Tyre* include narratologically interesting sets of inscriptions, I will discuss them first.

Xenophon's Ephesian Tale

Early on in their journey Anthia and Habrocomes had stopped at Rhodes and dedicated an inscribed epigram to the temple of Helius (1.12.2):

> So they toured the whole city and gave as an offering to the temple of Helius a gold panoply and inscribed on a votive tablet an epigram with the donors' names:
> Οἱ ξεῖνοι [κλεινοί] τάδε σοι χρυσήλατα τεύχε' ἔθηκαν
> 'Ανθία 'Αβροκόμης θ', ἱερῆς 'Εφέσοιο πολῖται.
> THE STRANGERS OFFERED YOU THESE WEAPONS OF BEATEN GOLD, ANTHIA AND HABROCOMES, CITIZENS OF HOLY EPHESUS.[8]

The text of the epigram is epigraphically not implausible, but rather literary and post-archaic in its flavor.[9] Near the end of the romance

[7] It is no longer generally believed that Lucian attacked Antonius Diogenes; cf. Morgan (1985) 490.

[8] The translations are mainly those available in *CAGN* (1989). My translations are separately marked as such. The Greek text is from Papanikolaou (1973).

[9] Note the obviously Homeric echo of Achilles' receiving his arms in *Iliad* 19.12-13: ὣς ἄρα φωνήσασα θεὰ κατὰ τεύχε' ἔθηκεν / πρόσθεν 'Αχιλλῆος. The word χρυσήλατος occurs in Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides. – For inscriptions, cf. *CEG* 1 (1983) 139, no. 263, an early classical dedication from the Athenian Acropolis: ἀνέθη[κεν 'Αθηναίᾳ τ]άδ' ἄε[θλ]α, "dedicated these prizes to Athena"; *CEG* 1 (1983) 197, no. 371, an archaic dedication from Olympia: [ἀνέθη]κε

the inscription is referred to again, with a new, second dedication (5.10.6):

> Meanwhile Leucon and Rhode, who were passing time in Rhodes, had set up a dedication to the temple of Helius, beside the golden panoply dedicated by Anthia and Habrocomes. They set up a stele cut in golden letters in honor of Habrocomes and Anthia, and the names of the dedicants, Leucon and Rhode, were also there ... (author's translation).

This consequently leads to a scene of recognition, where Habrocomes has read the text and Leucon and Rhode at long last recognize him. Soon an unhappy Anthia also returns to Rhodes, visits the place of the initial offering, once again during a festival in honor of Helius, and a third dedicatory inscription, composed by Anthia herself, is being set up (5.11.5-6):

> She said this and shed many tears and asked Hippothous to let her cut off a lock of her hair, as an offering to Helius, and put up a prayer about Habrocomes. Hippothous agreed; cutting off what she could of her hair and choosing a suitable opportunity, when everyone had gone away, she offered it with the inscription: ΥΠΕΡ ΤΟΥ ΑΝΔΡΟΣ ΑΒΡΟΚΟΜΟΥ ΑΝΘΙΑ ΤΗΝ ΚΟΜΗΝ ΤΩΙ ΘΕΩΙ ΑΝΕΘΗΚΕ. ON BEHALF OF HER HUSBAND HABROCOMES, ANTHIA DEDICATED HER HAIR TO THE GOD.[10] When she had done this and prayed, she went away with Hippothous.

The text is to the point and prosaic as in most dedications, thus epigraphically quite credible.[11] Right after this (5.12) Anthia is recognized by the same slaves, naturally not the same day they see the fresh dedication, but all the more happily so the day after, on the same spot.

It must be emphasized that all of these dedicatory inscriptions in the *Ephesian Tale* were set up on private initiatives and appear in a

---

Εὐρυστρατίδας τάδε τὰ ὅπλα, "Eurystratidas dedicated these arms." Cf. also *CEG* 2 (1989) 189, no. 777, a heavily restored dedication from early Hellenistic Athens: [κλεινῆς Κεκροπίδων πόλε]ως, Σωτῆρε, πολῖται [βωμοὺς τούσδ' ὑμῖν δαπάναις ἰδίαις ἀνέθηκαν, "the citizens of the famous city of Kekrops, o twin Saviors, dedicated these altars to you at their own expense." Furthermore, the numerous examples of the feminine adjective ἱερά referring to names of places mentioned in the index of *CEG* 2 (1989) 327 could be a novelty of late classical epigrams.

10 This time the text of the inscription is in Greek majuscles in the edition of Papanikolaou (1973).

11 Cf. Dittenberger (1915), 290-3, nos. 1127-35 for a series of more or less similar short prose dedications from the island of Delos. For a dedication of hair, cf. Dittenberger (1915) 288, no. 1123 (Amorgos, 3rd century A.D.).

religious context, at the temple of Helius,[12] during a religious festival in the first and the third case. It is also significant that the romance includes only three letters,[13] while as many as six to seven mentions and references to inscriptions are made.[14]

The anonymous' Story of Apollonius King of Tyre

In the early part of the romance, a statue with a public honorary inscription is set up in Tarsus in honor of Apollonius (10):

> Enriched by these great contributions, the citizens voted to have a bronze statue erected for him. They had placed in the city center a statue of him standing in a two-horse chariot, holding grain in his right hand and placing his left foot on a container of grain. On its pedestal they had this inscribed: *TARSIA CIVITAS APOLLONIO TYRIO DONVM DEDIT EO QVOD STERILITATEM SVAM ET FAMEM SEDAVIT.* TARSUS PAYS TRIBUTE TO APOLLONIUS OF TYRE FOR BRINGING AN END TO BLIGHT AND FAMINE.[15]

The text itself is rather vague – the idea is epigraphically more credible than the wording. This text functions as credentials by which the Tarsians may recognize Tarsia—shown by Ziegler to be similar to a text mentioning a grain gift from the Emperor Severus Alexander of A.D. 231/2[16]—and it is referred to in chapter 29:

> If after my death the guardians whom you call your parents should do you any harm, go to the marketplace, and you will find a statue of your father, Apollonius. Clutch the statue and proclaim, "I am the daughter of this man whose statue this is." The citizens are mindful of your father's favors and will come to your rescue if necessary.

---

[12] Cf. Saïd (1994) 220: Chariton, Xenophon, and Achilles Tatius.

[13] Cf. 2.5.1; 2.5.4; 2.12.1.

[14] One or two inscriptions irrelevant to the main plot must be added here: a heartfelt makeshift grave epigram for Hyperanthes, composed by his lover Hippothous (3.2) and an authentication – the whole story was supposedly commemorated in a γραφή (5.15) in honor of the goddess Artemis, but the word γραφή itself more probably refers to a drawing or some other type of writing than an inscription, cf. the introductory *ecphraseis* in Longus and Achilles Tatius.

[15] Edited by Schmeling (1988), *redactio A*. Cf. the varying wording towards the end of the text in *redactio B*: *TARSIA CIVITAS APOLLONIO TYRIO DONVM DEDIT EO QVOD LIBERALITATE SVA FAMEM SEDAVIT* and the lengthened wording in *redactio C*: *TARSIA CIVITAS APOLLONIO TYRIO DONVM DEDIT EO QVOD LIBERALITATE SVA FAMEM SEDAVIT CIVES CIVITATEMQVE RESTITUIT*. Cf. also *ILS* 1 (1892) 276, no. 1256.

[16] Ziegler (1984).

Two 'posthumous' inscriptions are also recorded for Tarsia, still alive (32 and 38):

> The townsfolk then continued to where the empty tomb had been provided by Dionysias and in return for the merits and favors of Tarsia's father, Apollonius, they had erected a bronze memorial and had it inscribed with these words: *DII MANES CIVES TARSI TARSIAE VIRGINI BENEFICIIS TYRII APOLLONII EX AERE COLLATO FECERUNT*. PRESENTED BY THE CITIZENS OF TARSUS TO THE SACRED MEMORY OF THE GIRL TARSIA IN REMEMBRANCE OF THE FAVORS OF APOLLONIUS OF TYRE.[17]

The second 'posthumous' inscription is in chapter 38:

> Apollonius believed that she had really died, and he said to his servants: "Collect all these possessions and take them to my ship. I'm going to my daughter's memorial." When he arrived there, he read this inscription: *DII MANES. CIVES TARSI TARSIAE VIRGINI APOLLONII {REGIS} FILIAE OB BENEFICIVM EIVS PIETATIS CAVSA EX AERE COLLATO FECERUNT*. THIS BRONZE MEMORIAL PRESENTED BY THE CITIZENS OF TARSUS TO THE SACRED MEMORY OF THE GIRL TARSIA, THE DAUGHTER OF KING APOLLONIUS OF TYRE, IN REMEMBRANCE OF HIS FAVORS. After reading the inscription he stood dumbfounded.[18]

The inscriptions are rather rare examples of tombstones set up publicly, although the Late Antique flowery style has not yet been reached.[19] Later on, another statue with an inscription—this time in Mytilene, dedicated to Apollonius and Tarsia—is mentioned (47):

> After saying this he ordered that the money be given to them at present. The townsfolk accepted the gold and had a huge statue cast of him standing on the prow of his ship and embracing his daughter with his right arm while he trampled on the head of the pimp. On it they had inscribed: *TYRIO APOLLONIO RESTITUTORI MOENIUM NOSTRORUM ET TARSIAE PVDICISSIME VIRGINITATEM SERVANTI ET CASVM VILISSIMVM INCURRENTI VNIVERSVS POPVLVS OB NIMIVM AMOREM AETERNVM DECVS MEMORIAE DEDIT*. TO APOLLONIUS OF TYRE, THE RESTORER OF THE CITY WALL AND TO TARSIA FOR MOST CHASTELY PRESERVING HER VIRGINITY IN THE FACE OF A VERY VILE MISFORTUNE, THE ENTIRE CITIZEN BODY OUT OF UTMOST

[17] Schmeling (1988), *redactio A*.
[18] Schmeling (1988), *redactio A*.
[19] Cf. *ILS* 2,2 (1906) 916, no. 8375, actually a will from A.D. 385.

> LOVE HAS PRESENTED THIS EVERLASTING MEMORIAL TO THEIR GLORY. To make a long story short, within a few days, to the delight of all the people, he gave his daughter in marriage to King Athenagoras in a happy state ceremony.[20] (author's translation).

Especially in the Tarsia part, this particular text is epigraphically implausible.[21] More importantly, however, at the end (50) the Tarsians acknowledge Apollonius' aid to them by referring to the inscription recorded at the beginning of the romance, almost as in the *Ephesian Tale*:

> They shouted in unison: "We declared you to be and affirm you to be the king and savior of this country for all time; we were willing and are still willing to die for you through whose help we overcame the threat of famine or death. The statue of you seated in a two-horsed chariot that we had erected testifies to this."

In the *Story of Apollonius King of Tyre* the honorific inscriptions appear to give credence to the plot, mostly in realistic situations. The contexts of the inscriptions are not especially religious, as in Xenophon, but they are public honorific monuments for Apollonius and Tarsia, partly 'posthumous'. It should be added here that the romance includes only two letters,[22] whereas there are no less than six to seven inscriptions or references to them.[23]

The 'sophistic' romances

Moving on to the more sophisticated set of romances, all of them in Greek, one is immediately struck by the absence of any inscriptions in the somewhat more ambitious work *Chaereas and Callirhoe* by

---

[20] Schmeling (1988), *redactio A*. Cf. the shortened varying wording in the central part of the text in *redactio B*: *<TYRIO> APOLLONIO RESTAURATORI AEDIUM NOSTRARUM ET TARSIAE SANCTISSIMAE VIRGINI FILIAE EIVS VNIVERSVS POPVLVS MYTILENES OB NIMIVM AMOREM AETERNVM DECVS MEMORIAE DEDIT* and the almost identically shortened wording in *redactio C*: *TYRIO APOLLONIO RESTAURATORI AEDIUM NOSTRARUM ET TARSIAE SANCTISSIMAE VIRGINI FILIAE EIVS VNIVERSVS POPVLVS MYTILENENSIVM OB NIMIVM AMOREM AETERNVM DECVS MEMORIAE DEDIT* .

[21] Although some fixed positive female qualities do recur in inscriptions, the idea of presenting Tarsia's misfortune and the preserving of her virginity fall outside the epigraphical habit. Cf. *ILS* 2,2 (1906) 935, no. 8442 for something faintly similar.

[22] Cf. chapters 20 and 26.

[23] The edict mentioned in chapter 7 may well not have been promulgated in an inscribed form. The authentication at the end of chapter 51 in recensio B and C refers to books, not to inscribed texts.

Chariton, and in the so-called sophistic romance *Leucippe and Clitophon* by Achilles Tatius. Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe* only refers to a few (promised) sacrifices or offerings, only twice possibly with inscribed texts: pipes dedicated to the Nymphs (2.22.1), images along with an altar to Eros, and a temple to Pan (4.39);[24] a partial reason for this could be that Longus set his scene mostly in non-urban surroundings. I do admit there is a reference to a diplomatic action between two towns, Mytilene and Methymna (3.2), but no reference to an inscribed decree is made. Because Heliodorus' *Ethiopian Story* seems to be exceptional in this respect, we must take a closer look at it.

The most important text recurring in Heliodorus' work is actually not an inscription, but a secret story of the abandoned Charicleia's circumstances on a waistband of woven silk, embroidered in native Ethiopian characters. It is first mentioned in 2.31, then deciphered (4.8), and afterwards (4.11) also translated for Charicleia herself. This secret badge of identification and a ring inscribed with sacred characters (8.11.9), recur more and more frequently towards the end of the story.[25] Would it be too simplistic to regard such σύμβολα and γνωρίσματα ('signs' and 'tokens of recognition', which they were initially called in 2.31) as just having been taken over from the plots of Attic New Comedy? More relevant, however, for this article is the idea where Theagenes and Charicleia decide to write secret messages—obviously graffiti—on shrines, famous statues, herms, or stones at crossroads (5.4.7-5.5.2), combining pseudonyms with scheduled itineraries, with tokens and passwords added, when needed. Later on (7.7) this secret agent routine is tried out in Memphis. All of this goes to show that Heliodorus seems to have written the story in his own peculiar way, like a detective story. The lowbrow *Ephesian Tale* and the *Story of Apollonius King of Tyre* certainly use inscriptions in a more straightforward and simple way in their narratives, anchoring them into the plot in a way that every reader can follow.[26]

---

[24] Epigraphically implausible wordings in 1.8.2, 2.24.1, and 2.31.1.
[25] Cf. 9.24; 10.13; 10.18.
[26] The rather subsidiary edict mentioned in 9.26 may well have been promulgated uninscribed.

As far as concerns letters and references to them in the more sophistic romances—four in Chariton,[27] six in Achilles Tatius,[28] notably none in Longus, and eleven in Heliodorus[29]—, they may serve as documents which affect plots and give romances a welcome freshness, but altogether differently from the inscriptions, because deep feelings are very often mirrored in them. Perhaps the inclusion of inscriptions in the narrative was felt less appropriate or awkward in the novels aimed at a more sophisticated readership. Or could it rather be the world of the popular folktale uniting *An Ephesian Tale* with the *Story of Apollonius King of Tyre* that really sets them apart from the other four high-brow romances?

The 'fringe' of the novel

Moving on towards the 'fringe' of the novel, more than half a dozen interesting texts need to be surveyed. The general picture changes thoroughly with the early imperial Latin novels by Petronius and Apuleius, the former one being even more episodic than the latter one. *Satyrica* plays on an altogether different level, following the ramblings of colorful characters. Thus the narrative is often broken, and things get unruly: at the beginning of the *Dinner of Trimalchio* (26-78), several less prominent private inscriptions and announcements—some of them comically exaggerated—are introduced (28, 29, and 30), two *instrumenta domestica* are presented (31 and 34), not forgetting two advertisement notices in chapter 38. The comical high point is reached in the bombastic and pathetic 'prehumous' mock epitaph, planned by the self-centered Trimalchio for himself (71).[30] Among many other things *Satyrica* also happens to include a mock letter and a mock answer to it (129-130), but the whole Menippean work most often breaks into verses. Apuleius' *Golden Ass* is another comparatively early rambling piece, but inscriptions are very rarely featured in it: only the wordings of a decree of a set-

[27] Cf. 4.5; 4.6; 8.4 (two letters). See also Létoublon, in this volume.
[28] Cf. 1.3; 4.11; 5.18, 5.20; 5.24; 5.25.
[29] Cf. 5.9; 7.24; 8.3 (two in all); 8.12-13; 10.2 (two in all); 10.34; 10.36.
[30] A few lines before this epitaph, however, a slightly altered version of the typical phrase *hoc monumentum heredem ne sequatur*, preventing alienation of the tomb, is mentioned. The only inscription—although not properly—mentioned beyond the *Dinner of Trimalchio* concerns a brand painted on the forehead of a runaway slave, found in chapters 103, 105, and 106.

ting up a statue (3.11) and an εὔπλοια inscription (11.16, a wish for a safe sailing voyage) are hinted at.[31]

As Photius' summary of Antonius Diogenes' possibly second century fantasy romance *Wonders Beyond Thule* explains, the work had introduced its authentication (111b) with a set of inscriptions: a soldier shows Alexander the Great and his generals some subterranean grave vaults outside Tyre with six short, but epigraphically rather implausible epitaphs.[32] Then followed the major authentication of the narrative, a small cypress box with an instruction (111b) to open it. The box contained the whole story, cut on cypress tablets referred to earlier (111a).

The plot of another second century romance, Iamblichus' *Babylonian Story*, also survives mainly in Photius' summary. Rather like in the *Aesop Romance*, an inscription on a stele, pointed out to the main figure Rhodanes during his flight (74a) reveals a gold treasure. Towards the end of the story (end of 77a) the father of the heroine Sinonis writes—with the blood of Rhodanes' killer dog—an epitaph for a corpse he thinks was his daughter and thereafter hangs himself. Then (77b) Rhodanes arrives and adds his own name in the text—more romantically with blood from his own initial wound—only to learn at the last moment that Sinonis' father had made a mistake. This particular series of epitaphs written in blood seems to replace a much less effective and romantic letter from Sinonis' father.

The *Aesop Romance* includes an illustrative example of the ironical attitude towards inscriptions. Aesop is depicted deciphering an (epigraphically incredible) abbreviated acrostic inscription in three different ways (78-80): first giving directions to a treasure, then advising the return of the treasure, and finally advising the division of the treasure. All of this makes his poor master, the philosopher Xanthus, look like a schoolboy in comparison with the clever Aesop.[33]

The *Alexander Romance* includes eight to nine inscriptions or references to them,[34] mostly in religious contexts and near each other in

---

[31] The other references are more peripheral: an inventory of a corpse on tablets (2.24), unintelligibly lettered metal plaques (3.17, cf. books written with unknown characters in 11.22), and ribbons lettered in gold (6.3).

[32] The texts include the name of the deceased and the age, in four cases expressed in years and nights or as being only a part of the age.

[33] Cf. Stoneman (1995).

[34] Cf. 1.3 (an oracle repeated in 1.34); 1.30 (a dedication to Ammon); 1.32 (an acrostic for the foundation of Alexandria); 1.33 (a prophecy in hieroglyphs); 2.31 (authenticating Sesonchosis at the edge of the world, in *recensio C* only); 2.34 (the

the first book;[35] but here the correspondence of almost 40 letters,[36] predominantly between Alexander and Darius, certainly represents the great majority of written texts within the narrative.

In the two late Latin accounts of the *Trojan War* by Dictys of Crete and Dares the Phrygian respectively, the former starts with an authentication, recalling Antonius Diogenes' work: the text had allegedly been buried in the grave of Dictys, found in A.D. 66, and then translated into Greek and Latin. Such a *Beglaubigungsapparat* is not unique in Greco-Roman fiction. As for inscriptions in these short prosaic war diaries, there are actually none.[37] Obviously, the soldiers were too busy fighting and writing their diaries.

Epilogue

My last comment touches on the Byzantine romance. So far I have only read through *Hysmine and Hysminias* by Eustathius Macrembolites. It is supposed to owe much to *Leucippe and Clitophon* by Achilles Tatius, but in contrast to Achilles' narrative it introduces inscriptions, mostly iambic verses within the description of the garden (2.6.1; 2.10.5; 4.17.2; and 11.4.5).[38] It must be added, however, that *Hysmine and Hysminias* does follow *Leucippe and Clitophon* in including rather conventional letters (9.9 and 10.2).

I do believe the study of inscriptions in Greco-Roman novels would benefit from the reading of much more Greek and Latin literature, thus furnishing a picture of the attitudes towards and reproductions of inscriptions, starting from the classical historians, prose literature from Hellenistic and Roman times, Christian novels, etc.

---

pillars of Hercules and Semiramis, in *recensio C* only); and 2.41 (instructions to travelers, not in *recensio β*). The only text that was only possibly inscribed is the edict in 2.21.

[35] See Stoneman (1995).

[36] Cf. 1.35; 1.36; 1.38; 1.39 (three in all); 1.40; 1.42; 2.8; 2.10 (three in all); 2.11 (three in all); 2.12 (two in all); 2.17; 2.19; 2.22 (four in all); 2.24-32; 2.43 (in *recensio C* only); 3.2 (two in all); 3.5; 3.18 (two in all); 3.25 (two in all); 3.26 (two in all); 3.27-8; and 3.33.

[37] Disregarding sporadic letters in these works, tablets inscribed in the Punic alphabet were used to elect Agamemnon as the war leader of the Greeks (Dictys 1.16).

[38] Cf. also 4.13.3.

APPENDIX: Towards a Typology of Inscriptions in Greco-Roman Novels[39]

1. Decrees, edicts etc.
Apuleius' *Golden Ass*, 3.11 (a decree concerning the setting up of an honorary statue)
Lucian's *True Story*, 1.20 (a peace treaty)
Heliodorus' *Ethiopian Story*, 9.26 (an edict, only possibly inscribed)
The Alexander Romance, 2.21 (an edict, only possibly inscribed)
The Story of Apollonius King of Tyre, 7

2. Dedications, honors, etc.
Petronius' *Satyrica*, 30 (a private dedication from Petronius' steward)
Xenophon of Ephesus' *Ephesian Tale*, 1.12.2 (a donor epigram to Helius, referred to in 5.10.6 and 8); 5.10.6 (a donor inscription commemorating the previous slave masters); 5.11.5-6 (a dedication of hair to Helius)
Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*, 2.22.1 (a private dedication of pipes to the Nymphs); 4.39 (a dedication of images and an altar to Eros; a temple to Pan); possibly without accompanying inscriptions
The Alexander Romance, 1.30 (a consecration of a shrine and an idol of Ammon)
The Story of Apollonius King of Tyre, 10 (referred to in 29 and 50); 32 (a honorific monument in memory of Tarsia and in honor of Apollonius); 38 (another version of the previous); 47 (another version erected in Mytilene)

3. Oracles, etc.
The Alexander Romance, 1.3 (referred to in 1.34); 1.33 (Sesonchosis' prophetic dedication in hieroglyphs, translated into Greek)

4. Epitaphs
Petronius' *Satyrica*, 71 (with a warning against alienation); 71 (a parody, before death)
Xenophon of Ephesus' *Ephesian Tale*, 3.2 (a grave epigram)
Antonius Diogenes' *Wonders Beyond Thule*, 111b (used also as an authentication)
Iamblichus' *Babylonian Story*, 77a (in dog's blood); 77b (in the hero's own blood)

---

[39] The word 'inscription' is taken here in a very broad meaning, including many texts that were not actually carved on stone (and would otherwise be outside the realm of modern Greco-Roman epigraphy), not excluding the ones that are possibly inscriptions, but happen to have no accurate wording. Letters or letter-like written documents are naturally excluded. The items are presented within each class and subcategory in a roughly chronological order, cf. e.g. *CAGN* (1989) 5.

5. *Instrumenta domestica*:
Petronius' *Satyrica*, 31 (on side dishes); 34 (wine labels on glass jars)
Apuleius' *Golden Ass*, 3.17 (unintelligibly lettered metal plaques; cf. also 11.22 for another unintelligible writing); 6.3 (ribbons lettered in gold)
Heliodorus' *Ethiopian Story*, 2.31 (a waistband embroidered in Ethiopian characters, translated or referred to in 4.8; 4.11; 9.24; 10.13; and 10.18); 8.11.9 (a ring set with a jewel with sacred characters)
Dictys of Crete's *Trojan War*, 1.16 (election tablets inscribed with Punic letters)

6. Acrostic (riddle) inscriptions
The Life of Aesop, 78, 79, and 80 (three different interpretations by Aesop)
The Alexander Romance, 1.32 (the foundation of Alexandria)

7. Miscellaneous
a) announcements:
Petronius' *Satyrica*, 28 and 29 (both legal); 38 (two commercial notices)
b) slave brand:
Petronius' *Satyrica*, 103 (also referred to in 105 and 106)
c) authentications:
Xenophon of Ephesus' *Ephesian Tale*, 5.15 (likely a painting or some kind of writing)
Antonius Diogenes' *Wonders Beyond Thule*, 111a (a cypress box, also referred to in 111b)
Lucian's *True Story*, 1.7 (Hercules' and Dionysus' travels); 2.28 (an epigram on Lucian's visit to the Island of the Blest)
The Alexander Romance, 1.31 (the edge of the world reached by Sesonchosis); 1.34 (pillars of Hercules and Semiramis)
d) directions to treasures, etc.:
Antonius Diogenes' *Wonders Beyond Thule*, 111b
Lucian's *True Story*, 1.32 (Poseidon's shrine); 2.3 (Galatea's shrine)
Iamblichus' *Babylonian Story*, 74a
cf. *The Life of Aesop*, 78 (acrostic, thus in class 6., cf. above)
Heliodorus' *Ethiopian Story*, 5.4.7-5.5.2 (graffiti indicating directions, referred to in 7.7)
The Alexander Romance, 2.41 (directions to the land of the Blest)
e) inventory:
Apuleius' *Golden Ass*, 2.24 (inventory of a corpse on tablets)
f) εὔπλοια inscription:
Apuleius' *Golden Ass*, 11.16 (written on the sail).

STRATEGIES OF AUTHENTICATION IN ANCIENT POPULAR LITERATURE

William Hansen

During a French military expedition in Egypt, there was found an ancient book of fortune-telling. A preface affixed to the English translation of the Egyptian work gives a brief account of its discovery and subsequent history.[1]

> After Napoleon I had been defeated at Leipzig, in the year 1818, he left behind him a 'Cabinet of Curiosities', among which the following Oraculum was found by a Prussian officer. This Oraculum, discovered in one of the royal tombs of Egypt during the French military expedition of 1801, had been translated, at the order of the emperor, into the German language by a celebrated German scholar and antiquarian. From that time forth it remained one of the most treasured possessions of Napoleon. He never failed to consult it upon every important occasion, and it is said that it formed a stimulus to his most speculative and most successful enterprises.
>
> The version which we give here is an exact translation of Napoleon's copy, for we have not deemed it either necessary, or desirable, to effect any elaborations or additions. Although the number of questions is not large, they cover an enormously wide field of human activity. We can do no more than to say that not only the emperor but numerous other people of fame and ability have found this Oraculum, by reason of the astounding accuracy of its answers, an invaluable help in the shaping of their destinies.

Known in English as *Napoleon's Book of Fate,* the book has been in print from the nineteenth century to the present day.

The preface however is a fraud from beginning to end. The work was not discovered in an Egyptian tomb; it was not rendered by a learned antiquarian from ancient Egyptian into a modern language; and it is safe to assume that Napoleon Bonaparte never counted it among his treasured possessions.

---

[1] Anonymous (1994) 250. Napoleon Bonaparte (Napoleon I) was born in 1769, conducted his Egyptian campaign in 1798-9, ruled as emperor from 1804-14, and died in 1821. The alleged date of discovery of the oracle book, 1801, presumably refers to Napoleon's Egyptian campaign, which took place around that time.

Later in the same century, around 1836, a man in Denmark named Victor Eremita purchased a desk from a dealer in used furniture. Taking it home, he accidentally discovered that it had a secret compartment containing the papers of two friends who had corresponded with each other, men quite different in character. One of them lyrically argued for the sensual life, whereas the other spoke of the superiority of the ethical life. Eremita found the collection so fascinating that he edited and published the papers under the title *Either/Or*, recounting in his preface how he had made his chance discovery.[2] It is a fine story, but as it happens not a word of it is true either. There was no Victor Eremita, no desk, and no correspondence discovered by chance. Rather, the letters of the sensualist, the letters of the ethicist, and the preface were all composed from start to finish by the same man, the Danish existentialist philosopher Søren Kierkegaard, who published these materials under the pseudonym Victor Eremita.

The prefaces to *Napoleon's Book of Fate* and *Either/Or* are instances of pseudo-documentarism, an author's untrue allegation that he (or she) has come upon an authentic document of some sort that he (or she) is drawing upon or passing on to his (or her) readers.[3]

The device is a common one in both high and low literature. For example, if one should judge Voltaire's *Candide* from its title page, one would suppose that it is not a work by the Frenchman at all but a translation of a book composed by a learned German author, a certain Doctor Ralph.[4] And according to the foreword of Hermann Hesse's novel *Der Steppenwolf*, the book derives from an autobiographical manuscript that was left behind in a rooming-house by a man named Harry Haller and subsequently edited by the landlady's nephew.[5] Similarly in his preface to *The Name of the Rose* Umberto Eco says he has merely rendered into Italian an old French translation of a work originally composed in Latin by a German monk in the fourteenth-century.[6] The supermarket tabloid *The Weekly World*

[2] Kierkegaard (1959) 1:3-15. See further Missotten (1999).

[3] For the term: Hägg (1983) 119; cf. 146. On the device more generally, see Speyer (1970), Paschoud (1995), Angelet (1999), and Hallyn (1999).

[4] The title-page of the original edition of 1759 reads: "Candide ou l' Optimisme. Traduit de l'Allemand de Mr. le Docteur Ralph." Beginning with the edition of 1761, the following line is added: "Avec les additions qu'on a trouvées dans la poche du docteur, lorsqu'il mourut à Minden, l'an de grâce 1759." See Pomeau (1959) 77-9; Tilkin (1999).

[5] Hesse (1928).

[6] Eco (1983).

News printed an article entitled "2,000-Year-Old Letter From Jesus Found!" in which it quotes fragments of a letter that it says a construction worker found in an ancient wooden chest in the mountains east of Jerusalem.[7] Nor is the device unknown to pornography. The preface to *A Bedside Odyssey* recounts how in the course of an excavation a Serbo-Croatian scholar, Virgili Phontofios, discovered an Egyptian manuscript containing an ancient erotic version of Homer's *Odyssey,* the existence of which had been mentioned by Aristotle.[8]

Pseudo-documentarism dissociates an author from his (or her) text, which is represented as having been authored by someone else at another time and place. Literature that is framed in this way is not of course an invention of modern times but has a long history that reaches back to classical and Near Eastern antiquity. Although it is found in Greece and Rome in association with compositions of different sorts, the practice of adding an authenticating preface or coda that was entirely invented became common in the imperial period, especially in writings of a popular nature, both novels and practical literature.[9]

Conventional Pseudo-Documentarism

Around the first century A.D. Antonios Diogenes penned his fantastic novel, *The Wonders Beyond Thule,* whose contents we know from a summary made by the scholar Photios. Antonios prefaces the novel with a letter in which he represents himself as being merely the editor of the work. The text itself, he says, has been recovered from a tomb. When Alexander the Great was besieging the city of Tyre, one of Alexander's soldiers discovered an ancient cemetery, and near the grave of a certain Deinias a wooden box was found on which was written: "Stranger, whoever you are, open this box to learn what will amaze you." They did so, finding inside an account of the astonishing adventures of Deinias inscribed on wooden tablets. Allegedly the text eventually came into the hands of Diogenes, who published it.[10]

---

[7] Jeffries (1998).

[8] Homer & Associates (1967) 5-9.

[9] On Greek and Roman popular literature see Pecere, Stramaglia (1996) and Hansen (1998).

[10] Photios *Bibliotheca* 166.

The conventional nature of this authenticating preface is illustrated by the fact that a similar tale introduces another novel that allegedly was discovered in a tomb. *A Journal of the Trojan War* (ca. 2nd century A.D.) by Diktys of Crete represents itself as the actual diary of a man who fought in the Trojan War. Allegedly Diktys' journal had been written on wooden tablets, which were placed in a box and buried with him on Crete. During the reign of the emperor Nero, an earthquake shook Crete, laying open Diktys' tomb, whereupon shepherds spotted the box, leading to the discovery and publication of the ancient journals.[11]

The two prefaces are identical in their general outline. (a) An account of a man's amazing adventures was inscribed on wooden tablets. When (b) he died, (c) the document was placed in a box and buried along with him. (d) Centuries later the grave and the box were discovered by chance, (e) and an editor published the narrative, (f) adding a preface that explained the remarkable circumstances of its production and chance discovery. The two prefaces are so similar that we should regard them as reflexes of a traditional story, a kind of legend transmitted primarily via written channels.

In addition to tombs, temples were fertile places for the discovery of wondrous documents. Temples did in fact sometimes have libraries and might serve also as community archives and museums. The ancient Greek book of fortune-telling known as *The Oracles of Astrampsychos* begins with an authenticating preface recounting its discovery in a temple. The alleged author of the preface is Astrampsychos, who says that he found this book after much effort in which he searched through the innermost rooms of different temples. According to Astrampsychos the handbook had been composed by Pythagoras and was later used by Alexander the Great, who owed to it his success in ruling the world.[12] (Presumably the work had been deposited in a temple by its alleged author, Pythagoras.) If we allow for the difference in genre, the story contained in this authenticating preface

---

[11] Prologue to Diktys *Ephemeris Belli Troiani* (pp. 2-3 Eisenhut). See further Speyer (1970) 55-9. Similar to Diktys' journal is the history of the fall of Troy that was attributed to Dares the Phrygian, who like Diktys was supposedly an actual participant in the Trojan War. According to its epistolary preface (p. 1, Meister), Cornelius Nepos discovered Dares' book in Athens, translated it into Latin, and now recommends it to his addressee, Sallustius Crispus.

[12] For a critical text see Stewart (2001); for a translation, R. Stewart and K. Morrell in Hansen (1998) 291-324. On Hellenistic writings attributed to Pythagoras see Burkert (1961).

is about the same as those that introduce the works of Antonios Diogenes and Diktys. (a) A famous man of old composed an amazing book, (b) which was placed in a temple or tomb. (c) Centuries later the document was discovered intact, (d) and an editor published it, (e) adding a preface that related the circumstances of its discovery.

We can characterize these instances of pseudo-documentarism as *conventional* or *normative*. There are many other such instances in antiquity of written works introduced by an authenticating preface falsely claiming that the document was written by an extraordinary man, that it is very old, and that it has come into the hands of the present editor by chance or after much effort.[13]

Formal Features

What strategies does conventional pseudo-documentarism employ? I illustrate three common devices.

First, it revels in accumulations of detail. The narrator fills out his account of the creation, preservation, discovery, and publication of the document with gratuitous and irrelevant pieces of information. We hear the names of persons, the names of places, and the circumstances under which pertinent events took place. For example, according to the preface of *A Journal of the Trojan War*, Diktys was a member of the Cretan contingent at Troy. His leaders asked him to compose a history of the campaign, which he did, writing on wooden tablets and using the Phoenician alphabet. He brought his history back home after the war, and on his deathbed he instructed that it be placed in a tin box and buried with him in his tomb. Time passed, and an earthquake struck Crete, laying open the tomb of Diktys. Shepherds noticed the box, and took it, thinking it was treasure. When they found that it contained only wooden tablets, they gave it to their master Eupraxides, and he in turn presented the books to the governor of the island, Rutilius Rufus, who brought them to the Emperor Nero in Rome. Nero, seeing that the tablets were written in the Phoenician alphabet, had Phoenician philologists decipher them, and from them he learned the astonishing fact that the tablets contained the actual records of an ancient man who had fought at Troy, the

[13] See Speyer (1970) 43-141 for numerous examples; cf. also Speyer (1971).

only known first-hand account, inasmuch as Homer himself had lived long after the war. The emperor gratefully bestowed Roman citizenship upon Eupraxides and arranged for a Greek translation of Diktys' book to be made, which he deposited in the Greek library.

The point of all this superfluous and basically insignificant detail is obviously to lend an atmosphere of verisimilitude to the report, creating an illusion that the reader will accept. Roland Barthes calls such accumulations of insignificant detail 'the reality effect'.[14] The reader is intended to feel that the narrator would not be so brazen as to present this profusion of incidental detail if it were not true.

The prefaces to the modern novels *Steppenwolf* and *The Name of the Rose* similarly teem with irrelevant detail. The narrator of Eco's book relates how on August 16, 1968, he was handed an old French book, a translation of an earlier manuscript. He was in Prague at the time. Six days later Soviet troops invaded Prague, forcing him to flee to Vienna. There he met his lover, and they sailed up the Danube, during which time he made a translation of the book, using a felt-tip pen. And so on. He continues with five pages full of minute and mostly irrelevant detail.

A common device for structuring gratuitous detail is the relay. The editor recites a series of persons, each of whom passes the precious document to the next, until it comes into the hands of its eventual editor, a process that hints at how easily the document might have gone astray. Thus in *The Wonders Beyond Thule* the cemetery in which Deinias lay was discovered by a soldier in Alexander's army; presently Alexander himself found the box containing the adventures of Deinias; the tablets came into the hands of Alexander's bodyguard, who made a transcription for his wife; and finally a copy of the transcription somehow reached Diogenes, who published it. So also in *A Journal of the Trojan War*, the box containing Diktys' diary was discovered by unnamed shepherds, who relayed it to their master, who relayed it to the governor, who relayed it to the emperor, who deposited it in a library. The document itself becomes a character with its own perilous and wondrous adventures.

Authenticating prefaces in modern literature of a popular nature also features relays. The preface to *Napoleon's Book of Fate* informs its reader that the work was found in an Egyptian tomb by French

[14] Barthes (1986). See also Paschoud (1995).

soldiers, came into the possession of the Emperor of France, was discovered among Napoleon's belongings after his death by a Prussian officer, and somehow ended up thereafter in the hands of an unnamed English translator. Similarly the original Italian edition of Eco's *The Name of the Rose* is allegedly a translation of a translation.

A second feature commonly found in conventional pseudo-documentarism is the exotic and romantic pedigree. The document may be wonderfully old, as in the case of Diktys' *Journal of the Trojan War*, which claims to be the actual journal of a man who fought in the Trojan War. Indeed, a document may be so exotic that its language or characters require an expert in decipherment. Since 'Diktys' wrote his journal in the Phoenician alphabet, Nero had to have Phoenician philologists transcribe and translate it into a language that a Roman might read. So also the ancient Egyptian original of *Napoleon's Book of Fate* had to be translated by an antiquarian so that the Emperor of France could understand it, after which it had to be rendered into English so that an Anglophone audience might consult it. In the same spirit Umberto Eco's book claims to be an Italian version of a French translation of a work composed originally in Latin. Such exotic and romantic details forge a thrilling link with a lost world.

A third device is celebrity association, the claim that a connection exists between the work and some prominent person. If devices of authentication argue that a document has an unusual identity, devices of recommendation argue that the document deserves to be valued, inasmuch as important persons have held it in high regard. Thus Nero so esteemed Diktys' *A Journal of the Trojan War* that he deposited it in a special library after generously rewarding the man who had brought it to him. The preface to *The Oracles of Astrampsychos* associates the handbook with no fewer than four important persons, saying that the work was composed by Pythagoras, that it was a treasured possession of Alexander the Great, that it was rediscovered by Astrampsychos, and that it is now being sent to the Pharaoh of Egypt. So the document boasts a famous author along with implied testimonials from three celebrities: the successful conqueror Alexander the Great, who once used the book to good effect; the famous magician Astrampsychos, who now recommends it; and its new owner, the Pharaoh of Egypt, who as a king is presumably used to having the best and as an Egyptian is surely a connoisseur of magic.

If these books were valued by such men as Alexander of Macedon, the Emperor of Rome, and the Pharaoh of Egypt, they ought to be good enough for anyone else.

Similarly in modern popular literature *Napoleon's Book of Fate* is not the simple-minded book of fortune-telling that it appears to be but rather was a valued possession of Napoleon, the secret resource of an extraordinarily successful man. And according to the *Weekly World News*, the authenticity of the letter written by Jesus has been happily confirmed by prominent experts, including the "noted historian-archaeologist Dr. Yoel Abu-Zuluf," who says: "We're incredibly excited by this find. We feel certain it's authentic. The age of the paper is consistent with the era of Jesus. It was found in the Mt. Olive area where He spent lots of time during His final days.... And, most revealing, the signature on the letter matches the one on the temple rosters."

Intensity

A different sort of pseudo-documentarism is illustrated by Xenophon of Ephesos' romantic novel, *An Ephesian Story*, composed around the second century A.D. The two lovers Habrokomes and Anthia are separated early in the story and are reunited again after experiencing many amazing adventures. At the end of his novel Xenophon writes that when the lovers managed to return together to their native city of Ephesos, they made their way just as they were to the temple of Artemis, prayed, sacrificed, and dedicated to the goddess a record of everything they had suffered and done.[15]

Why does Xenophon bother to mention that they recorded their story and dedicated it to the goddess Artemis? He must wish to imply that the events recounted in his novel did in fact take place, that a record of them was made by the very persons who had experienced them, that this record is preserved in a public place, and that he himself drew upon this record in composing his narrative.

[15] Xenophon of Ephesos 5.15.2 (p. 148 Miralles). The 'record' (*graphên*) that they set up, or dedicated, to Artemis could be of virtually any sort ranging from a purely verbal text to a purely visual painting, or something in between such as a painted tablet featuring text and illustration, like a modern Mexican *retablo*. The author treats the matter hurriedly, as though the principals dash into the temple, record their adventures, and dash out again, so that we should probably imagine a simple verbal text on perishable material.

Similarly, Redactions B and C of the novel *Apollonius King of Tyre*, composed by an unknown author, conclude with the notice that Apollonius lived peacefully with his wife for seventy-four years, ruling over Antioch, Tyre, and the people of Cyrene. He wrote an account of his and his family's fortunes, making two copies, one of which he deposited in the temple of Diana of the Ephesians—the same temple as that in which Anthia and Habrokomes deposit their record—, and the other in his own library.[16]

So both novelists include a notice at the conclusion of their stories in which they mention that the protagonists themselves make a record of their own adventures and deposit it in a temple. The novelist's implication is that his work is not mere fiction but draws upon, or reproduces, an autobiographical account written by the hand of the persons who actually experienced the adventures, and that a person might confirm this by consulting this document in the place it was deposited. We can call this *light pseudo-documentarism*. While it was of some importance to these novelists to imply that their story was somehow historical rather than fictional, their rhetoric in this regard is not emphatic, for they bury the authenticating statement at the end of their novel, almost as an afterthought, where it provides a kind of closure to the protagonists' adventures, instead of locating it in the usual epistolary preface, and they content themselves with merely implying a connection between the autograph document and the present narrative.

Longos' *Daphnis and Chloe* is unusual in employing, as it seems, both forms of authentication. In the tradition of conventional pseudo-documentarism the narrator claims in a prefatory statement that he got his tale from a narrative painting that he had chanced upon in a grove of the nymphs on Lesbos, while in the tradition of light pseudo-documentarism he says in passing at the end of his novel that the lovers dedicated images of themselves in the cave of the nymphs.[17] Presumably these latter are the very same as that which the

[16] *Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri*, RB and RC 51 (pp. 82, 136 Schmeling). RB reads: *casus suos suorumque ipse descripsit et duo volumina fecit: unum Dianae in templo Ephesiorum, aliud in bibliotheca sua posuit*. Cf. Perry (1967) 319-20. Similarly towards the conclusion of the apocryphal book of *Tobit*, composed by an unknown Jewish author around 200 B.C., the angel Raphael instructed Tobit and his son Tobias to record their adventures in a book, which must be either the book of *Tobit* itself or its source.

[17] Longos, *praefatio* and 4.39 (pp. 1, 65 Reeve).

narrator discovered and used as his source, although the narrator makes no explicit connection between them.[18] This combination, or something like it, is at least as old as the *Epic of Gilgamesh,* in which the narrator declares in his preface that Gilgamesh himself engraved all his toils on a memorial monument of stone, and also mentions the existence of a copper box that houses a tablet of lapis lazuli containing the story of Gilgamesh that one can read.[19] The written tablet preserved in a box is reminiscent of conventional pseudo-documentarism and the allusion to the protagonist's recording his own story is suggestive of light pseudo-documentarism, but the overall effect is closest to that of conventional pseudo-documentarism: the narrator takes care in his preface to assure his reader that the sources of the story he is about to relate go back to the hand of Gilgamesh himself and are moreover available for public inspection.

A different extreme is illustrated by the work *On the Virtues of Plants*, composed allegedly by Thessalos of Tralles, a celebrated medical doctor of the first century A.D.[20] The book provides information about healing plants in relation to the zodiac and the seven planets, giving instructions on when and where to gather the plants and how to make medicines from them. The wonderful knowledge contained in this book was revealed to Thessalos directly by a god. Thessalos gives an account of the book's origin in a long epistolary preface addressed by him to the Emperor of Rome, to whom he is commending his work.

According to this preface, Thessalos went to Egypt to meet men who were knowledgeable in medicine, and in the course of a strenuous quest he persuaded an old priest in the Egyptian city of Thebes to arrange for him to meet a god. The author went to the old man's house, taking along with him paper and ink. After the priest performed certain magical rites, the god Asklepios appeared to Thessalos and dictated to him an herbal and mineral treatment for every human ailment, which Thessalos wrote down. After instructing Thes-

[18] The object discovered by the narrator is called an *eikonos graphên*; the objects dedicated by Daphnis and Chloe, *eikonas*. That the ring-composition is unobvious, or perhaps not there at all, is illustrated by the Loeb translators Townley and Edmonds (1916), who (adopting Brunck's emendation, *eikona graptên*) render the former as "a painted picture," which it clearly is, but the latter as something quite different, "statues." See also John Morgan, in this volume.

[19] *Epic of Gilgamesh,* Tablet 1.i; for an English translation see Dalley (1989) 50-1.

[20] For the text see Friedrich (1968). See Winkler (1985) 258-62.

salos not to share this information with just anyone, Asklepios ascended into the sky.

The claim in this preface is much grander than that made in conventional pseudo-documentarism. It takes the form of a very long narrative that details the author's arduous quest for medical knowledge in Egypt; his source is a divine being, indeed a god of healing himself, so that his information certainly ought to be reliable; and Thessalos did not merely come upon the wondrous document but was present at its inception, taking it down by dictation. Among its devices of recommendation is an interesting instance of reverse psychology, for Asklepios is represented as saying that the circulation of the present document must be restricted, since the rare and wonderful knowledge it contains is not intended for the ordinary person. We can call this *heavy pseudo-documentarism*. The emphasis here is not only upon the importance of the document but also upon its reliability. Thessalos' book rests upon the authority of a supernatural being.

Of the three forms of pseudo-documentarism that I have distinguished—conventional, light, and heavy—only the first two are employed in connection with narrative fiction, at least in classical antiquity. The third form, making as it does a claim of divine authorship, is attached only to documents of magical or religious import.[21]

Earnestness

Authors and readers clearly differ in how earnestly they intend or accept the fraud. At the earnest end of the continuum stand the creators of such works as the ancient *Oracles of Astrampsychos* and the modern *Napoleon's Book of Fate*, fortune-telling books whose acceptance by readers may depend upon the readers' belief in the marvelous pedigrees and powers of the works. The same is true of other works that make claims of special efficacy, such as *On the Virtues of Plants* by Thessalos of Tralles. The authors of these handbooks make bold claims and grant the reader no peek behind the curtain of their fraud.

Other authors are playful while still maintaining the illusion of a special source. In his preface to *Daphnis and Chloe* Longos' narrator says that once he was hunting on the island of Lesbos and came upon

[21] For additional examples see Speyer (1965-6) 100-9; (1970) 23-42.

a beautiful painting in a grove of the nymphs. It was, he learned, a famous picture, one that attracted the local inhabitants as well as foreign visitors. The picture recounted a true event, a tale of love. A longing came over the narrator to write the tale out, so that with the help of a local interpreter of the picture he produced a written narrative that corresponded to the image. According to the narrator, his book is at once an offering to the gods and also medicine for lovesick or loveless human beings. Longos' sophisticated preface is a whimsical version of the sort of authenticating preface that introduces a truly practical work such as the *Oracles of Astrampsychos*. Both narrators claim to have found their document in a holy sanctuary; both describe the pains that they took; and both advertise the powerful properties that their book possesses, in the one case for persons who wish to know the future, in the other for persons troubled by love.

Among modern authors who show a sophisticated and playful attitude toward pseudo-documentarism is the philosopher Kierkegaard, who obviously enjoyed playing mind-games not only with his readers but also with himself. He had a secretary write out his manuscript for *Either/Or* so that his own publisher should not recognize his handwriting, and of course he did not place his own name on the book. But the pseudonym that he chose was not a very credible one: Victor Eremita, 'Victor the Hermit', not a Danish name at all. Perhaps it was a name that even issued a challenge to the reader to discover the author's identity. In any event, even after everyone in nineteenth-century Copenhagen who cared had concluded that the author was Kierkegaard, the philosopher continued to engage in deception, at least in his own mind. He penned a letter to Victor Eremita in which he asked Eremita to state publicly that Kierkegaard was not the author. He also wrote an answer, in which he had Eremita say that he could not do so because he did not himself know who the author was and that therefore it could easily be Mr. Kierkegaard.[22]

At the other end of the continuum of earnestness stand the authors of novels such as *Wonders Beyond Thule* by Antonios Diogenes. For in spite of the elaborate apparatus the author contrives in order to

---

[22] Hohlenberg (1954) 16-20. Kierkegaard did not however publish all the letters he penned under his and Eremita's names. Voltaire played precisely the same game; see Tilkin (1999) 187-9.

give his narrative an ancient and exotic pedigree, Diogenes is also quite straightforward in declaring that the whole edifice is manufactured from beginning to end; indeed, according to Photios, Antonios even gives his sources.[23] In modern times the same open spirit is found for example in Hesse's *Der Steppenwolf*. Readers will not mistake *Der Steppenwolf* for an actual autobiography of a real Harry Haller, especially when they see the name of the prominent novelist Hermann Hesse right on the cover of the book. Antonios Diogenes and Hermann Hesse are more interested in the elaborateness of their illusion than in the maintenance of the illusion as such.

Conclusion

Concluding this sampling of pseudo-documentarism, I make a few observations and speculations. Of the many instances of pseudo-documentarism found in antiquity I distinguish three ideal types employed in ancient popular literature, which I label light, conventional, and heavy pseudo-documentarism. Recurrent features are gratuitous detail, romantic associations, a connection with important persons, discovery in a grave or temple, and divine revelation. Pseudo-documentarism continues to be employed by authors of both serious and light literature in our own day, both secular and religious, and essentially the same strategic elements are found, in part because the modern literary practice derives ultimately from the ancient but mostly because they work so well.

What does pseudo-documentarism offer authors? A means of passing one's work off as that of a more important or authoritative or interesting person from another time and place. If the work is allegedly old, pseudo-documentarism also solves the problem of discontinuity, claiming that although the present work has long existed, it has been lost, buried in a tomb or lost in a temple or forgotten in a drawer, and only recently recovered. What does the device offer readers? A verisimilitude that seems to guarantee truthfulness, assur-

[23] Photios *Bibliotheca* 166.111a: "He says of himself that he is the author of an ancient story and that even though he is fabricating wondrous and false things, he has the authority, for his numerous stories, of older writers, from whose work he has compiled his collection, at the cost of much labor. He cites at the beginning of each book the names of the persons who treated its subject previously so that the incredible events would not seem to lack authority." (Translation by Sandy [1989] 781).

ance of the importance or power of the work, the thrill of making a fragile connection with something distant and unusual, or the playful pleasure of an elaborate or romantic game of pretense.

In antiquity, pseudo-documentarism is particularly common in the novel. The idea of literary fiction developed rather late in antiquity and in a context of historical literature, so that Greek novelists seem to feel a kind of embarrassment in recounting events that they have simply made up or borrowed. The device of pseudo-documentarism allows them to suggest that their story rests upon real events, and it permits them to make this claim somewhat ambiguously, since they are free to leave unclear the extent to which they are in earnest or just having fun.[24]

---

[24] For bibliographic help I am grateful to Julene Jones, Françoise Létoublon, and the editors.

PART THREE

THE ANCIENT NOVEL AND BEYOND

This page intentionally left blank

ARCHAIC IAMBOS AND GREEK NOVEL: A POSSIBLE CONNECTION

Giuseppe Zanetto

It is well known that archaic iambos is poetry of blame and abuse, its main goal being to pour scorn on those members of the community who have in some way broken the rules of social behaviour.[1] At the same time however the iambic performance is a form of entertainment in which—as in the carnival—desires and tendencies that are usually repressed by a social sanction, are allowed to find expression.[2] The typical tone of iambography is an alternation of invective and transgression; its mode is a mixture of linguistic violence and aggressiveness that can hardly be compared with the pathos of the Greek novel. In a short essay on the iambic tradition Carles Miralles argues that the traditional opposition between iambic and heroic poetry reproduces itself in the prose narrative of the imperial period, the first developing into the realistic romance (as Petronius' *Satyricon*), the second into the idealistic love novel.[3]

So it may seem *prima facie* hopeless to try to trace in the big five any connection with archaic iambos. Nevertheless I think that this connection does exist, not only in the literary texture of the novels, which is so rich and varied that influences of almost every genre can be detected and recognised,[4] but also at a deeper level of narrative structure. In my paper I would like to proceed empirically, discussing some passages, especially from Achilles Tatius, which can be interpreted in the light of an iambic model, in some degree still operating in the Roman period.

The first series of texts refers to narrative situations in which a character shows his knowledge in matter of love and sexuality, instructing other characters or talking with them on this subject. Sexu-

---

[1] Aloni (1993) xiv: "Scopo principale della poesia giambica è la proclamazione del biasimo (μῶμος) nei riguardi di quanti violano le regole collettive di comportamento".

[2] Degani (1993) 9-14.

[3] Miralles (1989) 128-30.

[4] Fusillo (1989) 25-6. Scarcella (1971) 259-60 gives a very useful account of *loci* from which Longus' imitation borrows.

ality is a major interest of iambic poetry; there is plenty of sex in the transmitted fragments, and very often this topic is treated with crude language and a cynical attitude.[5] But in the light of newly acquired texts we can suppose that, when an iambic performer tells stories of rape and seduction, he is not referring to real life:[6] so, although these poems apparently encourage an illicit approach to sexuality, they probably aim at helping young people (the νέοι ἄνδρες who are the standard audience of a iambic performance) to develop a complete self-consciousness, so that they can join the adult community.[7] If this is true, and education in sexuality is a function of iambic poetry in archaic Greece, then it is self-evident that archaic iambography can be an important point of reference for a novelist. All Greek novels are in fact, although in different ways, handbooks of amatory art.

In the opening chapters of Achilles Tatius' book 4, we are told that the leader of the Egyptian army, Charmides, falls in love with Leucippe and tries to persuade her to have sexual intercourse with him. The situation recalls a traditional pattern of archaic poetry that we can call *oarismòs*: the passionate conversation between a male and a female character, the first attempting to overcome his partner's resistance and succeeding both by means of persuasive arguments and gentle violence. The archetypal model is *Iliad* book XIV, the episode of the so called *Diòs apáte* (Zeus' deception), when Zeus is seized by a fierce sexual desire at the sight of Hera and, arguing that his impulse needs to be satisfied immediately, passes from words to deeds and lays her down on the meadow of Mt. Ida while a golden

[5] West (1974) 28: "The sexuality and vituperation characteristic of Archilochus' iambi are paralleled in the other two famous iambographers, Semonides and Hipponax"; Aloni (1993) xvii: "Oltre che di invettiva e di riso, le donne sono nel giambo anche oggetto di desiderio. Un desiderio espresso in termini espliciti, crudi, sovente osceni".

[6] Nagy (1976) 193.

[7] Pellizer (1991) 22-3: "Qualche esempio abbastanza tipico di violazione dei patti di amicizia fa emergere l'importanza, per il gruppo dei φίλοι, degli scambi matrimoniali e degli accordi ad essi relativi. Ciò rende conto, tra l'altro, della presenza di una topica relativa al matrimonio e le donne, che se non è propria della poesia giambica, vi è certamente ben rappresentata, e del ricorrere del problema delle 'ragazze da marito', come le Lykambides e le figlie di Telestagoras"; Koenen (1974) 506-7: "Die archaische Gesellschaft hatte ein anderes Verhältnis zur Sexualität als eine spätere Zeit. Erziehung zur Liebe und Einübung der Liebe gehörten zu den Aufgaben archaischer Jugendbünde, welche in festen Formen bei bestimmten Gelegenheiten und Festen die jungen Männer und Frauen zusammenführten [...] In der archaischer Gesellschaft konnten dabei auch die Dichter eine belehrende Funktion einnehmen".

cloud comes down from the heaven to protect the divine couple from indiscreet glances.[8] Another example of this narrative is the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*, where the reaction of Anchises to the sudden, enchanting appearance of the goddess is inspired by the same mixture of desire, love and brutality.[9]

But the text that we can most profitably compare with Achilles Tatius' passage is Archilochus' *Cologne Epode*.[10] We have here a dialogue between a maiden (i.e. Neobule's sister), who tries to divert her lover's aggressiveness to other possible targets, and the 'I' (that we can conventionally identify with the poet himself) who nevertheless goes on pursuing his goal. The girl draws Archilochus' attention to a παρθένος of her house who can be a good candidate for marriage (vv. 3-9):

> εἰ δ' ὦν ἐπείγεαι καί σε θυμὸς ἰθύει,
> ἔστιν ἐν ἡμετέρου
> ἣ νῦν μέγ' ἱμείρε[ι γάμου
> καλὴ τέρεινα παρθένος· δοκέω δέ μι[ν
> εἶδος ἄμωμον ἔχειν·
> τὴν δὴ σὺ ποίη[σαι φίλην.

> If you can't wait and your desire is urgent, there's somebody else at our house now longing for a man, a lovely slender girl, there's nothing wrong (if I'm any judge) with her looks. Why not make friends with her?[11]

Archilochus has a good answer to every objection of the girl. He claims that: a) he knows many possible ways of reaching sexual pleasure, so that they will be bound to find a good solution for their needs (vv. 13-18):

> τ]έρψιές εἰσι θεῆς
> πολλαὶ νέοισιν ἀνδρ[άσιν
> παρὲξ τὸ θεῖον χρῆμα· τῶν τις ἀρκέσε[ι.
> τ]αῦτα δ' ἐφ' ἡσυχίης
> εὖτ' ἂν μελανθῇ[
> ἐ]γώ τε καὶ σὺ σὺν θεῷ βουλεύσομεν.

---

[8] Homer, *Iliad* 14.292-351.

[9] *Homeric Hymns* 5.143-67.

[10] Archilochus, fr. 196a W; full commentary (by E. Degani) in Degani, Burzacchini (1977) 3-22.

[11] Translations of Archilochus and Anacreon are taken from West (1993); for Achilles Tatius and Longus I have used the translations by Winkler (1989) and Gill (1989) respectively; other translations are my own.

> The love-goddess offers young men a range of joys besides the sacrament, and one of them will serve. We'll talk of all this, you and I, at leisure, when ... grows dark, and may God be our aid.

b) he wants no other partner than his young interlocutor, because she is the only one who attracts him (vv. 24-41). Love-making is possible, and in particular love-making with that girl is possible: this is the summary of his argumentation. The whole episode can be seen as a lesson in love which is given by the poet. This is very clear in the final lines, where Archilochus seizes the girl, wraps her in his cloak and strokes her body gently, soothing her fear with a crescendo of intimacy (vv. 48-53):

> μαζ]ῶν τε χερσὶν ἠπίως ἐφηψάμην
> ...]ρέφηνε νέον
> ἥβης ἐπήλυσιν χρόα
> ἅπαν τ]ε σῶμα καλὸν ἀμφαφώμενος
> ...]ον ἀφῆκα μένος
> ξανθῆς ἐπιψαύ[ων τριχός.

> Gently I touched her breasts, where the young flesh peeped from the edge of her dress, her ripeness newly come, and then, caressing all her lovely form, I shot my hot energy off, just brushing golden hairs.

Everything in this description suggests that it is her first sexual experience[12] and that the poet is her διδάσκαλος ἔρωτος. But in his speech too the poet shows a superior knowledge in matters of love: he knows about the many different delights that young men can derive from Aphrodite (τ]έρψιές εἰσι θεῆς / πολλαὶ νέοισιν ἀνδρ[άσιν, vv. 3-14), he can judge whether a girl is suitable for marriage or not (Νεοβούλη[ν / ἄ]λλος ἀνὴρ ἐχέτω, vv.4-5; ὅπως ἐγὼ γυναῖκα τ[ο]ιαύτην ἔχων / γεί]τοσι χάρμ' ἔσομαι, vv. 33-4). That is to say, he is well-versed both in the theory and in the practice of sexuality.

If we consider now our passage of Achilles Tatius, we can note that it is based on the same pattern: here too a man tries to control the sexual behaviour of a girl, who is the target of his desire, acting from a position of superior knowledge. A comparison of the two texts reveals interesting parallels both in wording and thought. Let us consider in particular Achilles Tatius 4.7.7-8:

---

[12] At lines 46-47 the comparison with a fawn stresses the fear of the young girl, who needs to be calmed and encouraged by her partner's gestures.

"βούλει τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἀκοῦσαι τῆς ἀναβολῆς; ἡ γὰρ αὔτη χθὲς ἀφῆκε τὰ ἔμμηνα, καὶ ἀνδρὶ συνελθεῖν οὐ θέμις." "Οὐκοῦν ἀναμενοῦμεν," ὁ Χαρμίδης εἶπεν, "ἐνταῦθα τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἢ τέτταρας, αὗται γὰρ ἱκαναί. ὃ δὲ ἔξεστιν αἰτῶ παρ' αὐτῆς· εἰς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἡκέτω τοὺς ἐμοὺς καὶ λόγων μεταδότω· ἀκοῦσαι θέλω φωνῆς, χειρὸς θιγεῖν, ψαῦσαι σώματος· αὗται γὰρ ἐρώντων παραμυθίαι. ἔξεστι δὲ αὐτὴν καὶ φιλῆσαι· τοῦτο γὰρ οὐ κεκώλυκεν ἡ γαστήρ."

"Well, do you want to know the real reason for her delay? She had her period just yesterday, and it is not decent for her to be that close to a man". "In that case we'll wait," said Charmides, "three or four days. That should be enough. For now, I'd like her to go as far as decency does allow: let me look at her and talk with her. I want to hear her voice, hold her hand, touch her body: such foreplay has some satisfaction. And then too we might kiss: her female problems are no obstacle to that, I trust."

Of course in Achilles Tatius there is no proper *oarismòs*, because Charmides does not talk with Leucippe, but deals with her through an intermediary (the Egyptian Menelaos, a good friend of Leucippe and Clitophon). But the way the dialogue develops has much in common with the line of the Archilochian encounter. Learning that there are problems that require a delay, Charmides accepts the idea of postponing the fulfilment of sexual intercourse, and imposes the terms of the delay: three or four days will be enough. At the same time he suggests possible surrogates: looking, talking, kissing. Doing so, he plays the role of an arbiter in matters of love, a position he can claim by virtue both of his social position and of his knowledge. We have seen that the attitude of Archilochus in the *Cologne Epode* is very similar: he too acts as an arbiter who has the right to impose conditions. He suggests that he and the girl may better discuss questions of love later, under cover of darkness,[13] and he stresses that beside the divine thing there are other delights of the goddess, one of which will be sufficient for him.

Lexical parallels also suggest that in writing this episode Achilles Tatius probably played on Archilochian reminiscences. Charmides wants to stroke the girl's body (ψαῦσαι σώματος), and stroking the body of Neobule's young sister is exactly what Archilochus does in the final lines of the epode, where σῶμα is object of ἀμφαφώμενος,

[13] This is the meaning of line 17, if we accept the restoration μελανθῇ [νύξ, ὁμοῦ (Page), which is very likely to catch at least the point of the passage.

but ἐπιψαύων immediately follows, governing a lost noun for which the most likely restorations are τριχός or κόμης. It is noteworthy that ψαύω and ἐπιψαύω are nowhere else used by Achilles Tatius (nor by the other Greek novelists) in connection with σῶμα. Charmides also wishes to hold Leucippe's hand (χειρὸς θιγεῖν), as Archilochus wants to do Neobule's in fr. 118 εἰ γὰρ ὣς ἐμοὶ γένοιτο χεῖρα Νεοβούλης θιγεῖν ("I wish I had as sure a chance of fingering Neobule").

I would like to add that the word match χειρὸς θιγεῖν occurs two other times in Achilles Tatius (and nowhere else in the *corpus*): in 6.11.1 Melite touches Thersandros' hand as a gesture of supplication, in her attempt to appease his anger; more interesting is 2.4.4, where the context is explicitly erotic. Here too a character plays the role of a love teacher: Satyros suggests to his master Clitophon the right strategy to start a more intimate relationship with Leucippe. The first step is to enter into conversation with her; then it is time to hold her hand, checking her reaction:

> θίγε χειρός, θλῖψον δάκτυλον, θλίβων στέναξον. ἢν δὲ ταῦτά σου ποιοῦντος καρτερῇ καὶ προσίηται, σὸν ἔργον ἤδη δέσποινάν τε καλεῖν καὶ φιλῆσαι τράχηλον.
>
> Touch her hand; squeeze her fingers; sigh deeply. If she submits to this and allows you to continue, your next step is to call her your lady and kiss her neck.

Clitophon accepts his slave's guidelines; using an athletic simile he speaks of Satyros as a good coach (πιθανῶς ... παιδοτριβεῖς). This is a kind of linguistic label that points, once again, to the semantic field of education; and one is tempted to think that it is exactly the image of love-education or love-training that raises in the novelist's mind the Archilochian reminiscence involved in the phrase θιγεῖν χειρός.

Archilochus' presence also reveals itself in the following scene (2.5). After Satyros' departure Clitophon engages in a two-voice soliloquy, in which he plays the role both of the seducer and of the wise adviser. First he encourages himself to take advantage of the circumstances and go on courting Leucippe; but these exhortations are silenced by the super-ego, who reminds him that he already has a fiancé; this girl, and not the new-comer Leucippe, is the right one for him, for this girl he must reserve his attention (2.5.2):

παρθένον ἔνδον ἔχεις ἄλλην καλήν· ταύτης ἔρα, ταύτην βλέπε, ταύτην ἔξεστί σοι γαμεῖν.

You have another lovely maiden in your own family: desire her, gaze at her; marriage with her is in your power.

The phrasing is once again very close to a passage of the *Cologne Epode*, where the maiden tells the poet that he does not need to go around looking for a wife, because he already has at his disposal a beautiful girl who is worthy of his love (vv. 3-9): The sentence παρθένον ἔνδον ἔχεις ἄλλην καλήν is balanced in the Archilochian text by vv. 4-8:

ἔστιν ἐν ἡμετέρου
ἣ νῦν μέγ' ἱμείρε[ι γάμου
καλὴ τέρεινα παρθένος· δοκέω δέ μι[ν
εἶδος ἄμωμον ἔχειν.

The sequence ταύτης ἔρα, ταύτην βλέπε, ταύτην ἔξεστί σοι γαμεῖν corresponds with v. 9 τὴν δὴ σὺ ποίη[σαι φίλην. The core of the argument in both texts is the same and is expressed in the same terms: inside the house there is a lovely girl; take her.

Education in love is the central interest of Longus, as the novelist himself stresses in his prologue.[14] So it is by no means strange that his literary memory too sometimes feeds on iambic material. Scholars usually point to Longus 1.13.2, a description of Daphnis from the point of view of Chloe:

ἦν δὲ ἡ μὲν κόμη μέλαινα καὶ πολλή, τὸ δὲ σῶμα ἐπίκαυστον ἡλίῳ· εἴκασεν ἄν τις αὐτῷ χρῴζεσθαι τῇ σκιᾷ τῆς κόμης.

His hair was dark and thick, and his body was tanned by the sun; you could have imagined that his body was taking its dark colour from the shadow of his hair.

The shadow of the hair almost certainly derives from Archilochus fr. 31 W ἡ δὲ οἱ κόμη ὤμους κατεσκίαζε καὶ μετάφρενα ("... her hair hung down shading her shoulders and her upper back"), which is likely to be the source of Anacreon fr. 71.1-2 Gentili;[15] according to the Hellenistic rule of *imitatio cum variatione* Longus transfers the

---

[14] Longus Pr. 3 "It [i.e. this book] will cure the sick, comfort the distressed, stir the memory of those who have loved, and educate those who haven't".

[15] καὶ κ[όμη]ς, ἥ τοι κατ' ἁβρὸν / ἐσκία[ζ]εν αὐχένα ("and the hair that shaded your delightful neck"). Both passages are indicated by Hunter (1983) 116 as possible models for Longus.

Archilochian image of the girl's hair shadowing her shoulders to his male protagonist.[16] This also seems to be the key of Longus' imitation in the episode of Lycaenion in 3.15-18. In the whole *corpus* this is the passage in which the lexicon of erotic education is most explicitly and extensively used. Lycaenion offers to teach Daphnis the art of lovemaking: the verb διδάσκω occurs several times, together with the other educational verb παιδεύω. It is the female partner who controls the situation, owing to her superior experience: she lays Daphnis down on the ground, encourages him to embrace and kiss her. Lycaenion wants to check if the boy is physically mature to make love, if his body has the right reaction to sexual stimulation. When she discovers that he is capable of action and is swollen with desire (μαθοῦσα ἐνεργεῖν δυνάμενον καὶ σφριγῶντα, 3.18.4) she refrains from giving any other direction and lets nature operate. Archilochus too uncovers the girl's young flesh (νέον ... χρόα), which reveals the on-coming of her maturity as a woman (ἥβης ἐπήλυσιν), and lets his force come out (*Cologne Epode*, vv. 49-53).

A second iambic pattern that we can trace in the romance is the animal fable (αἶνος). The remarkable frequency of the αἶνος in iambic poems has been noted and discussed by many scholars, in particular by François Lasserre.[17] In Archilochus' fragments we can recognise at least three fables: the fox and the eagle (fr. 174-81 W), the sick lion (fr. 225 W), the ape and the fox (fr. 185-7 W).[18] Semonides also seems inclined to adopt the form of the fable: fr. 13 W probably belongs to the αἶνος of the beetle and the eagle, fr. 9 W is almost certainly the *incipit* of an αἶνος in which the actors are a heron and a buzzard competing for the possession of an eel.[19] Even if no fable material can be found in Hipponax's fragments (which is perhaps surprising, but we must consider how scarce our knowledge of Hipponax is), one can conclude that the animal fable was a favourite pattern of archaic iambography.

---

[16] It is interesting to note that also in Anacreon the description refers to a boy.

[17] Lasserre (1984) 63-5.

[18] Lasserre (1984) 63 thinks that traces of three other fables can be detected in Archilochus; but there is no general agreement on this point: when the fragments are very short extreme prudence is called for. In the catalogue of Van Dijk (1997) 138-48 only the fables of the fox and the eagle and of the ape and the fox are given as certain; a third αἶνος (the wolf and the dog, fr. 237 W) is regarded as possible.

[19] Lasserre (1984) 64; Van Dijk (1997) 148-9.

What was the function of the αἶνος in iambic performance? Let us consider Archilochus' fr. 185 W; the first line—probably the *incipit* of the entire poem—is an apostrophe to someone (to whom the poem is addressed) and presents the fable as the starting-point for the poetic discourse: ἐρέω τιν' ὕμιν αἶνον, ὦ Κηρυκίδη ("I want to tell you folk a tale, your Honour"). This can be connected with the view of Karl Meuli, who thinks that the fable, at the first stage of its literary history, is created *ad hoc* for a definite occasion; or that an already existing fable, created for another occasion in the past, is re-used for a new situation.[20] In any case it can be argued that in archaic Greek culture the αἶνος is a rhetorical device that a speaker adopts when addressing his interlocutor in a polemical tone and with an aggressive attitude.[21] Evidence for that is provided by the only hexameter example of αἶνος, the fable of the hawk and the nightingale in Hes. *Works* 202-12, whose first line is:

> νῦν δ' αἶνον βασιλεῦσι ἐρέω φρονέουσι καὶ αὐτοῖς
>
> Now I will tell a tale for the kings, although they themselves perceive it.

Hesiod addresses the greedy (δωροφάγοι) kings, who are the target of his warnings, with an introductory formula which is very similar to that of Archilochus fr. 185 W. Of course a poem, when it is introduced by a fable, immediately assumes a low profile, because the αἶνος refers to values which do not coincide with the aristocratic value-system. It is very unlikely that an aristocrat (or a poet playing the role of an aristocrat) would start his song with an Aesopic tale: there are no examples of αἶνος in Homer, nor in monodic lyric or elegiac poetry.[22]

The iambic use of the αἶνος is comparable to the function of μῦθοι and αἶνοι in Aristophanic comedy. Aristophanic characters can express their aggressiveness by telling μῦθοι which are intended to support their position and to ridicule their rivals. Such is the case in *Lysistrata* 781-96 and 805-20: the Old Men's chorus tell the μῦθος

[20] Meuli (1975) 743; see also West (1984) 108.

[21] Rosen (1988) 31: "That the ainos could be incorporated into the iambos as a vehicle of abuse [...] is shown by several Archilochian fragments"; Van Dijk (1997) 168: "Both Archilochus [...] and Timocreon [...] use two fables to attack some personal rival, menacingly or scoffingly".

[22] Davies (2001) analyses Homer, *Odyssey* 14.457-506 and 21.193-210 as two examples of 'fable', but his perspective is very different from mine.

of the misogynist Melanion, using an introductory formula of Archilochian flavour (v. 781 μῦθον βούλομαι λέξαι τιν' ὑμῖν, "I want to tell you a story") and the Old Women reply with the story of the misanthropist Timon, introduced by a very similar formula vv. 805-6:

κἀγὼ βούλομαι μῦθον τιν' ὑμῖν ἀντιλέξαι τῷ Μελανίωνι.

I want to tell a story too in reply to your Melanion.

In this passage the wording itself (λέξαι and ἀντιλέξαι) suggests that the two μῦθοι are meant as weapons in a verbal fight, so that their use is clearly related to a competitive context. In other cases the vehicle for aggression can be an Aesopic tale, which exactly corresponds to the iambic αἶνος (even though the word αἶνος never occurs in Aristophanes). Particularly interesting is the final section of *Wasps*, where Aesopic and Sybaritic tales are used by Philocleon to address people that he wants to abuse.[23]

In Achilles Tatius 2.20-22 the iambic use of the αἶνος as a vehicle for abuse and mockery takes the form of verbal duel between two slaves, Konops and Satyros.[24] The first plays the role of the *durus ianitor*: suspecting that Clitophon wants to sneak into Leucippe's room under cover of darkness, he stays up until far into the night, keeping the door of his room wide open, so that it is impossible for Clitophon and Satyros to take any initiative. Trying to make friends with him, Satyros begins to mock him and to pun on his name (2.20.2), προσέπαιζε πολλάκις καὶ κώνωπα ἐκάλει καὶ ἔσκωπτε τοὔνομα σὺν γέλωτι, ("... he tried joking with him, calling him in fun a pesky gnat"). With these words we are immediately taken into a iambic atmosphere, because punning on the meanings of names and nicknames is a literary game that iambography likes to play (together with Aristophanic comedy).[25] Conops reacts by telling Satyros the fable of the lion, the elephant and the mosquito, and Satyros replies

[23] Aristophanes, *Wasps* 1399-1405, 1427-32, 1435-40.

[24] As the analysis of Van Dijk (1996) demonstrates, this is the only passage in the big five where Aesopic fables are narrated *in extenso*. Van Dijk is certainly right when he says (p. 526): "The only extant parallel for this fable fight is the violent exchange of fables between Menelaos and Teucer in the so-called burial debates in Sophocles' *Ajax*"; but, due to the tone of the episode, I would exclude any tragic reminiscence and point rather to the burlesque and aggressive use of the fable which is typical of the iambic and comic tradition.

[25] Bonanno (1980) 76-9; Zanetto (2001) 72-4.

with the story of the mosquito, the lion and the spider.[26] The sentence that introduces the first αἶνος is particularly interesting: Conops pretends to respond to Satyros' joke, but his apparently innocent and amusing story is a cover that hides his implacable hostility: προσεποιεῖτο μὲν ἀντιπαίζειν καὶ αὐτός, ἐνετίθει δὲ τῇ παιδιᾷ τῆς γνώμης τὸ ἄσπονδον ("But Nat [...] pretended to respond to Satyros's playful banter, using a silly little story to signal his firm intention not to collaborate").

The function of the fable in Archilochus is exactly the same: it is part of a communication system that attaches very great importance to allusion, to talking by αἰνίγματα. Conops' story concludes (2.21.4) with a sentence that contains the concealed meaning of the fable: ὁρᾷς ὅσον ἰσχύος ὁ κώνωψ ἔχει, ὡς καὶ ἐλέφαντα φοβεῖν ("So you see how strong the gnat is, that even an elephant is afraid of him"); it is of course a veiled threat, expressed through a comparison of animals. Here too Archilochus can be the model: fr. 201 W suggests that the poet (probably the *persona loquens* of the poem) is stronger than his opponents, as the hedgehog is cleverer than the fox: πόλλ' οἶδ' ἀλώπηξ, ἀλλ' ἐχῖνος ἓν μέγα ("The fox knows lots of tricks, the hedgehog only one—but it's a winner").

What conclusions can we draw from this (still very partial) selection of passages? First, it is very likely that the novelists had a direct knowledge of most of archaic iambography. This by no means contradicts other data at our disposal. The period to which our Greek novels go back (I-III cent. A.D.) is characterised by a renewed interest in archaic poetry. Enzo Degani's thorough analysis of Hipponax's fortune in the imperial period leads to conclusions that can be extended to the other iambographers and to the whole iambic genre.[27] The second century in particular, with its so called "Renaissance", seems to produce a revival of studies, which is attested by a large number of papyri:[28] and it is maybe not fortuitous that the most "iambic" among the big five, i.e. Achilles Tatius, writes just in this cen-

[26] The meaning of these two fables in the context of the novel and their literary tradition are discussed by Delhay (1990) and Van Dijk (1996).

[27] Degani (1984) 72-80.

[28] On Hipponax's papyri see Degani (1984) 75. From Montevecchi's list (1988) 360-1 we can see that in the second cent. there are 8 papyri of Archilochus and 3 of Hipponax; if we look at the list of Archilochus' and Hipponax's papyri in West (1989) 354-5, we have (in a total amount of 30 papyri) 13 papyri of the second cent., 6 of the second-third cent., 7 of the third cent.

tury. Secondly, the clever use of the iambic tradition is a good argument for those who think that the Greek novels, although they show some characteristics of *Unterhaltungsliteratur*, are cultivated texts in which hidden quotations, allusions, and veiled reminiscences play an important part.[29] In the wide panorama of studies on Greek narrative the inquiry into sources and literary texture is still a primary (and relatively neglected) field of research.

---

[29] Bowie (1994) 451-3.

RESISTANT (AND ENABLING) READING: PETRONIUS' *SATYRICON* AND LATIN LOVE ELEGY

Judith P. Hallett

Thanks to Tacitus' obituary at *Annales* 16.17-20, and to the memorable 1951 cinematic adaptation of H. Sienkiewicz' 1895 novel *Quo Vadis*, it is tempting to imagine Petronius as customarily in a recumbent, horizontal position: as an ancient Roman equivalent of a "lounge lizard."[1] But, off as well as on his feet, exactly where does Petronius stand? In a provocative article published in a British journal nearly three decades ago, P.G. Walsh faulted William Arrowsmith, Helen Bacon, and Gilbert Highet, a triad of critics at that time residing on American shores (and precisely because they inhabited those very shores), for crediting Petronius with a moral stance.[2] Arguing that the *Satyricon* lacked a moralizing intent, Walsh did concede that the work declared a(nother) 'trinity of values': social refinement, literary taste and a more rational attitude toward life and death. According to Walsh, however, Petronius assigns these values a role subordinate to that of the parodic literary entertainment, which dramatizes a series of themes traditional in Roman satire (Walsh [1974] 187-9).

Replying to Walsh in the same journal two years later, my fellow American John Wright attempted to explain what Walsh had judged an American moralistic response as, instead, an American literary one (Wright [1976] 33-8). Yet Wright did not address the question of whether a literary response can also be moral, or for that matter political. Nor did he consider whether, and how, a literary response takes a stance merely by virtue of engaging with earlier literary texts that assume certain moral and political values. This discussion will address that question.

[1] For this Hollywood Petronius and his ideological relationship to the politics of the Cold War during the McCarthy era, see Wyke (1994) 23-4, who argues for a subversive element in his characterization.

[2] Walsh summarizes in turn the theses of Bacon (1958), Arrowsmith (1966), and Highet (1941). Citing them again by name, as "three scholars in America proclaiming the message that Petronius is a moralist, deliberately depicting a society choking to death with luxury and greed", he then asserts that "the arguments against all these variants of the 'moralist' thesis are in my view overwhelming" (183-4).

At least I will maintain that one, often underlooked, episode in Petronius' writing appears to offer a resistant reading of one earlier Latin literary work—namely the eighth poem in Propertius' fourth book of elegies—and of Latin love elegy as a genre. I refer to chapters 16 through 26 of the *Satyricon*. It describes the visit made by the priestess Quartilla and what we might euphemistically term her support staff to the tawdry temporary lodgings of yet a third trio: the narrator Encolpius, his rival and sidekick Ascyltos, and their beloved boy attendant Giton. I will conclude by reflecting on where, politically if not morally, we are to locate the kind of literary resistance Petronius would seem to offer. And I will suggest that such resistance might in fact also be a form of enablement, reactionary albeit voluptuary, and not necessarily subversive in its aims.

The word 'resistance' tends to evoke European struggles against fascism in the second World War, associations that endow the term 'resistant reading' with heroic undertones as well as subversive overtones.[3] Still, like the notion of Petronius-the-moralist, the concept of resistant reading is strongly identified with, and prominent in, a distinctly American and feminist way of looking at literature. Thus Amy Richlin, of the University of Southern California, asserts "We can resist," to the audience of her essay, 'Reading Ovid's Rapes' ([1992] 179). With this injunction, Richlin invokes a tenet of feminist literary criticism originally promulgated in 1978 by Judith Fetterley, of the State University of New York at Albany, in *The Resisting Reader*. Fetterley's book provides strategies for responding to texts that—to quote another American classicist, Ronnie Ancona—"call upon the female reader or critic to identify with the male as a universal subject" ([1994] 15). In so doing, such texts may also require women readers and critics to deny the worth of their own perspectives and experiences.

The idea of reading resistantly has its detractors as well as its adherents among American classicists. Alden Smith's recent study of poetic allusion in Augustan poetry, for example, advocates a "readership of embrace", rooted in the teachings of the theologian

[3] See, for example, s.v. 'resistance' in the *American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language* (Picket [4]2000] 1484): "3. often Resistance An underground organization engaged in a struggle for national liberation in a country under military or totalitarian occupation."

Martin Buber, as a 'necessary corrective' to resisting readership ([1997] 18-22, 137-8). Yet Smith's approach demands an uncritical acceptance of both the text at hand and its assumptions that may exacerbate the difficulties encountered by any readers, male and female readers, who do not completely share the values presumed and championed by a particular text. And, as Richlin emphasizes, resistance to masculist and hierarchical textual interpretations has a positive function, since it enables feminists, other marginalized individuals and indeed all readers to revitalize these same texts by appropriating them for more personally valid retellings ([1992] 179).

Fetterley originally applied her strategies of resistant reading solely to American works of fiction, novels and short stories by canonical male authors. Prominent among them is Washington Irving's 'Rip Van Winkle,' itself a misogynistic rewriting of the scenario in Homer's *Odyssey* (Fetterley [1978] 1-11). Both Ancona and Richlin, however, have deployed these very strategies in their own feminist interpretations of Latin literary works: Ancona in her 1994 book on Horace's *Odes*, Richlin in her 1992 essay on Ovid's representations of rape in the *Metamorphoses, Fasti,* and *Ars Amatoria*.[4]

So, too, I myself have argued that resistance is not merely a form of interpretation, and re-interpretation, available to contemporary readers alienated from the perspectives and assumptions that permeate a given text. Indeed, I have contended that Ovid represents his female narrator in *Metamorphoses* 13, the sea-nymph Galatea, as herself a 'resisting reader' of Horace. For Ovid portrays Galatea as recalling the words and scenario of *Odes* 3.13—which celebrates the sacrifice of a young male goat in the waters of the *fons Bandusiae*—in the pastoral wooing song by her domineering and detested suitor Polyphemus. Inasmuch as Ovid has Galatea echo this Horatian poem while sorrowfully lamenting the brutal treatment suffered by her lover Acis at Polyphemus' hands, Galatea would also appear to protest Horace's portrayal of human brutality and animal sacrifice.[5]

---

[4] See, too, Ancona's engagement with Fetterley's ideas in Ancona (1989) 51.

[5] Hallett (1990). This paper was originally presented [with students in Latin 302, "Ovid", spring 1990 at the University of Maryland] at the fall 1990 meeting of the Classical Association of the Atlantic States, October 12, 1990, Princeton University; it is forthcoming from *Classics Ireland*.

Among Galatea's echoes of the Horatian ode is Polyphemus' description of her at *Metamorphoses* 8.791 ff. as *splendidior vitro, tenero lascivior haedo, floridior*

When representing characters in their writings as alluding to and contesting the values presumed by earlier literary texts, were Roman authors also offering resistant readings themselves? I would like to suggest that this is precisely what Petronius is doing at *Satyricon* chapters 16 through 26 by having his narrator Encolpius evoke Propertius 4.8, and thereby parody and challenge several elegiac conventions, particularly those linked with amatory and gender-specific behavior. Petronius is not, of course, the first Roman satirist to challenge the erotic and literary assumptions of Roman elegy. Approximately a century earlier, in *Satires* 1.2, Horace had bluntly critiqued the sexual arrangements and scenarios that frequently figure in love elegiac verse.[6]

In this poem Horace focuses on men's choice of sexual partners to illustrate the value and virtue of avoiding all manner of extremes. At lines 28-36 he targets adulterers—those who pursue the wives of other élite men (34-6: *alienas… / uxores, / cunni… albi*: "wives of other men"; "of a white-robed cunt")—as one unfortunate group of extremists. Yet after describing the dangers and physical sufferings endured by such men, Horace criticizes those who have affairs with freedwomen, mime actresses and courtesans in lines 47-63 (47-8: *tutior at quanto merx est in classe secunda / libertinarum dico*?; 57-9 *nil fuerit me, inquit, cum uxoribus umquam alienis. / verum cum mimis, est cum meretricibus, unde / fama malum gravius quam res trahit:* "how much safer is doing business in the second category, I refer to freedwomen?"; "He says 'In no way will there ever have been any liaison between me and other men's wives.' 'But you have liaisons with mime actresses, and with courtesans, from which your reputation takes a greater toll than your estate"). After all, such

---

pratis: "more gleaming than glass, more sexually playful than a tender goat, more blooming than meadows." A long list of other phrases follow that similarly consist of the same construction, comparative adjectives in the nominative case accompanied by nouns in the ablative of comparison. These echoes also include Polyphemus' reference to his cave at 810 as *vivo pendentia saxo* : "hanging from living rock " and his use of the ablatives absolute *nullo ducente* : "with no one leading" at 781 and *me coniuge*: "with me as your husband" at 819 Horace's language is further evoked by the details of Acis' transformation into a horned body of water in the midst of bloodshed (with, *inter alia*, *exsultantibus undis* and *nova cornua:* "leaping waves" and "new horns" at 892 ff.).

[6] For the date of *Satires* 1.2, see Fraenkel (1957) 75 ff., who judges it the earliest, or one of the earliest of the *Satires*; the first book was published some time before 31 BCE.

women demand huge sums of money and/or damage the reputations of their male lovers.

For the first 118 lines of the poem Horace limits his examples of bad behavior to named and unnamed individuals presumably familiar to his intended audience. One, addressed at line 81 as Cerinthus, has the same name as that which the elegist Sulpicia assigns her beloved. Not insignificantly, at 80-2 Horace takes issue with his preference for the physical charms of women of high birth, bedecked in pearls and emeralds, over a prostitute in a toga (*nec magis huic, inter niveos viridisque lapillos* / *sic licet hoc, Cerinthe, tuum tenerum est femur aut crus / rectius, atque etiam melius persaepe togatae est:* "nor is a woman's thigh more delicate or her leg better shaped among snow-white or green jewels, although you may feel this way, Cerinthus, and often a toga-clad whore is even more physically appealing").[7] In the last sixteen lines, however, Horace personally testifies to the sexual and other satisfactions he derives from partnering, as it were, with a cheap, willing prostitute (119: *non ego*: *namque parabilem amo Venerem facilemque*: "not for me: for I love love-making that's attainable and easy").

Strikingly, this first-person narrative mode resembles that adopted by elegiac poets such as Catullus, Propertius, Tibullus and presumably Gallus to celebrate their illicit liaisons with precisely the kind of women Horace judges problematic: other men's wives, freedwomen, mime actresses, and courtesans.[8] Horace would also seem to be utilizing a literary model, as well as a literary mode, favored by the love elegists so as to fault them and their message. In lines 105-8, he evokes *Anthologia Palatina* 12.102, an epigram on love by Callimachus, to whom elegiac poets paid frequent homage.[9]

---

[7] The relationship between these Horatian lines and Sulpicia [Tibullus] 3.16 needs further exploration. In 3-4 Sulpicia complains that her beloved Cerinthus seems to prefer a low-born paid sexual partner in a toga to herself, the daughter of Servius (*sit tibi cura togae potior pressumque quasillo / scortum quam Servi filia Sulpicia*: "although concern for a toga, and a whore weighed down with spinning gear, is more powerful than Sulpicia, daughter of Servius, for you"). Strikingly, at 3.8.19-20, Sulpicia describes herself as adorned with pearls.

[8] For the social circumstances of the equestrian order in first century BCE Rome as particularly suitable for poetic production in the first person (a "peculiarly ego-centered dialogical situation" which he terms "the lyric genre"), see Miller (1994) 124 ff.

[9] For Callimachean homage as a standard feature of Catullan and elegiac poetry, see Clausen (1964) 181-96.

Yet in lines 109-10, he proceeds to challenge not only this poem's praise of inaccessible objects that inflict heavy emotional pain, but also the value of these verses as emotional consolation.

Still, in *Satires* 1.2 Horace does not develop an elaborate dramatic situation, with himself at the center of the action, like the scenarios characteristic of Propertian, Tibullan and eventually Ovidian elegy. At the end of the poem he justifies his own choice of female partner in language evocative of a mime performance about adultery. For there he notes that he need not worry about a husband's unexpected return from the country, with battered door, baying dog, noisy household, fears for the woman's dowry, her maid's limbs, and his life.[10] But he does not represent other men's wives, nor even the other kinds of women he criticizes for the costs and shame their favors bring—freedwomen, mime actresses and courtesans—as deliberately subjecting lovers to cruel emotional treatment. Nor, while recognizing the emotional pains that desire for such women causes, does he mention the explanations that elegists themselves offer for tolerating such treatment.

As it happens, Propertius 4.8, which appears to have been written in 'the teens' BCE (and thus fifteen to twenty years after Horace's first book of satires), does develop an elaborate dramatic scenario, related totally in the first person, with the poet himself at the center of the action.[11] What is more, it foregrounds the cruel emotional and physical treatment that the poet claims to have suffered at the hands of his beloved Cynthia, and offers two justifications for such

[10] Strikingly, Horace's description of these potential perils at lines 127 ff. evokes the scenario of the mime, and consequently has various affinities with Propertius 4.8 and Petronius' Quartilla episode, the two texts discussed in greater detail below. Of particular interest are Horace's *ianua frangatur, undique magno / pulsa domus strepitu resonet* and *ne nummi pereant aut puga aut denique fama*: " [nor do I fear that] the door may be broken down; that the house may resound with a great noise, struck on all sides" and "so that neither money or hindquarters or finally reputation may perish." Propertius 4.8.19-20 claims that a *turpis rixa sonuit, / si sine me, famae non sine labe meae*: "a foul brawl rang out / if without me, not without a blemish to my reputation", and at 49-50 states that *sonuerunt … postes:* "the doorposts rang out with a sound" when Cynthia returns. At *Satyricon* 19.1, Encolpius comments that *omnia mimico risu exsonuerant*: "everything had rung out with the laughter of a mime."

[11] For the date of Propertius 4.8, see Hubbard (1974) 117-18. Three of the poems in Book 4 (1, 6 and 11) allude to events of 16 BCE. Hence the entire book is often thought to postdate that year; individual elegies, however, might have been written somewhat earlier. As Cynthia is portrayed as alive in 4.8, and dead in 4.7, 4.8 may be among the earliest in the book.

treatment that also figure in other, Propertian and non-Propertian, elegiac texts. Let us briefly review its scenario. 4.8 opens in a learned Callimachean fashion, ordering the reader to learn the causes of an uproar that happened one night on the Esquiline Hill (1-2: *Disce, quid Esquilias hac nocte fugarit aquosas, / cum vicina novis turba cucurrit agris*: "Learn what sent the watery Esquiline into turmoil on this night, when a neighboring mob rushed about on the New Fields"). It then lists various details about an obscure religious ritual in the nearby town of Lanuvium. During this rite, lines 3-14 report, a virgin feeds a snake, and thereby—if she is truly chaste—ensures fertility of the crops in the year to come (11-14: *ille sibi admotas a virgine corrupit escas: / virginis in palmis ipsa canistra tremunt / si fuerint castae, redeunt in colla parentum, / clamantque agricolae "Fertilis annus erit."*: "the snake snatches up morsels offered to him from the virgin; the baskets themselves tremble in the virgin's hands. If the maidens should have been virtuous, they return to their parents' embrace, and the farmers shout 'It will be a fruitful year.'").

The description of this ritual leads into an acknowledgment at lines 15 ff., that Cynthia treated Propertius cruelly by going off to worship at Lanuvium with another man. Propertius, however, has a ready explanation for Cynthia's behavior: her claim of religious obligations, in this case to the goddess Juno, an explanation offered by both Propertius and other Roman elegists elsewhere to account for erotic neglect and even abandonment by the women they adore.[12] Curiously, Propertius fails to note the incongruity of Cynthia's involvement in this rite for virgins, although he does point out that she is truly worshipping Venus rather than Juno (16: *causa fuit Juno, sed mage causa Venus*: "Juno was the reason, but Venus more of a reason").

In the lines that follow, Propertius describes Cynthia's departure in a pony-driven vehicle along the Appian Way as a military triumph (17: *Appia, dic, quaeso, quantum te teste triumphum:* "Appian Way, tell me, I beg you, how great was the triumph with you as a witness"). He speaks of a noisy tavern brawl that brought him shame, and refers to her in line 21 as a *spectaclum*, dramatic sight, to behold. He next relates, also in military language (28: *mutato volui castra movere toro:* "since my bed had been changed, I wanted to relocate

[12] Cf., for example, Propertius 2.33, Tibullus 1.3, and Ovid, *Amores* 3.10.

camp"), that he sought to console himself with precisely the kind of women Horace recommends, two of them in fact, along with both wine and song. Yet Propertius reports at lines 43 ff. that disaster soon ensued: the lights flickered, the table fell over, and he himself could not perform sexually with these hired companions, since he was thinking of Cynthia at her ritual.

At this point, however, Cynthia suddenly returned. She is again described with both the word *spectaclum* and in a military metaphor (56: *spectaclum capta nec minus urbe fuit*: "nor has there been less of a spectacle when a city has been captured"). Propertius attests that she physically attacked one of his two partners, and that the other called for help and their lamps awakened the respectable citizens of the neighborhood. He then, at lines 63-70, recounts how Cynthia battered and bit and beat him up as well as inflicting physical harm on his innocent male slave. Margaret Hubbard has argued that whereas in 4.7 Propertius assigns the revenant Cynthia the role of Patroclus and himself that of Achilles in Homer's *Iliad,* in 4.8 "Cynthia appears as the vengeful Odysseus, Propertius as a Penelope less constant than her mythical progenetrix" ([1974] 152-3).

Notwithstanding these Greek epic antecedents, 4.8 is also a Roman aetiological elegy. Propertius proceeds, at lines 71 ff., to employ legal as well as military language in relating Cynthia's demands and his own abject apology. As she did in evoking of the conquering military hero Odysseus, Cynthia again adopts a masculine role, this time that of Roman lawgiver (74: *accipe, quae nostrae formula legis erit*: "accept, what the wording of my law will be"). After Propertius reports that Cynthia performed a ritual purification of the premises, he attests, in military terms yet again, that they made love (88: *et toto solvimus arma toro*: "and we let our weapons loose on the entire bed"). The success of their lovemaking after all the physical abuse Propertius claims to have endured at Cynthia's hands warrants emphasis, because the justification he gives for enduring cruel emotional treatment by his *domina*—that it enhances his sexual performance—is one that he also voices elsewhere.[13]

But let us turn from verse satire and elegiac poetry to Petronius' Menippean satire, and his Quartilla episode. And let us return to the

[13] E.g. at 1.10.21 ff.; 2.14 and 3.8.

contention that this episode critiques and parodies the scenario in and assumptions of Propertius 4.8, and, for that matter, of love elegy in general. As we have seen, 4.8 makes use of conventions and themes employed in various other Roman love elegies, among them the elegist's justification of his emotional mistreatment by sexually promiscuous, heartless, even physically abusive women like Propertius' Cynthia on religious and performative grounds.

Like the Propertian elegy, the Quartilla episode is related by a first person narrator – albeit not Petronius himself playing himself, but the literarily learned, self-deluded, youthful Encolpius. As the *Satyricon* is widely acknowledged to have functioned as an extended allusion to and parodic revision of Homer's *Odyssey,* so Propertius 4.8—as we have seen—recalls and parodically rewrites the scenario of this earlier epic work.[14] There are, moreover, numerous verbal and thematic links between Propertius' poem and Petronius' episode. They suggest that Petronius was familiar with, and assumed his readers' familiarity with, this particular Propertian text. At the very least they allow the possibility that Petronius was acquainted with, and assumed an audience acquainted with, some Augustan elegiac writings.

After all, both Propertius' elegy and Petronius' episode feature a nocturnal setting, and women's involvement in religious rites. Both texts assign a prominent role to a virgin: the elegy uses the word *virgo* three times (at 6 as well as 11 and 12); the episode also uses it three times, plus the diminutive *virguncula* twice and the verb *devirginari,* to deflower. Both texts make frequent figurative use of military and legal language when describing erotic activities, including such words as *victor,* conqueror, *lex,* law, *causa,* reason, and *iniuria,* injustice.[15]

---

[14] Although, as Conte has maintained, Petronius is not only burlesquing the adventures of Odysseus by transforming them in a farcical rewriting. He also portrays his narrator Encolpius as reading "his own experiences as an incarnation of the Ulysses myth" and interpreting "his adventures as episodes of an *Odyssey*"…which was not farcical for him (Conte [1996] 90 ff.).

[15] Cf., for example, *Satyricon* 19.5: *ut si depugnandum foret*: "so that if fighting would have to take place"; 20.8: *non repugnanti puero*: "on the boy who was not fighting back"; 24.7: *belle cras in promulside libidinis nostrae militabit,*: "it will beautifully perform military duty tomorrow as an apéritif for our lust"*;* 26.1 and 3: *ebriae mulieres longum agmen plaudentes fecerant…non repugnaverat puer*, "the drunken women, clapping their hands, had made a long battle formation…the boy had not fought back."

Both elegy and episode also place a major emphasis on hands: Propertius uses the metrically convenient noun *manus* three times; Petronius' text, though for the most part written in prose, uses *manus* twelve. So, too, both texts portray the tying up of feet. Propertius does so at 4.8.80 (*et pedibus vincula bina trahat*: "may he drag two sets of chains on his feet") when depicting Cynthia's command that the slave Lygdamus be punished. Petronius does so at *Satyricon* 20.4, when Encolpius relates how Quartilla's *ancilla* bound both the hands and feet of himself and his two companions. Just as Propertius has Cynthia claim at 4.8.16 that she abandoned Propertius to worship Juno while actually paying homage to Venus, so Petronius has Quartilla invoke the goddess Juno in defense of her unorthodox sexual conduct (25.4: *Iunonem meam iratam habeam, si umquam me meminerim virginem fuisse*: "may I have my Juno angry, if I should remember that I ever was a virgin."). In both the performance-noun *spectaculum* (shortened a syllable in the elegy) appears in connection with female erotic self-assertiveness: at Propertius 4.8.21 and 56, and twice in *Satyricon* 26.5. There the term refers to the consummation of a mock-marriage between Encolpius' boy beloved Giton and the seven-year-old virgin that Encolpius is forced to watch with Quartilla.

Laughter plays a major role in both the elegy and the episode. Indeed, Petronius employs the noun *risus* six times in the course of the Quartilla episode. So do sounds of various sorts, especially those of doors.[16] Each scenario centers on a public building of low status; a tavern (19: *taberna*) in Propertius 4.8, what one might call a flophouse (16.4: *stabulum* and 19.2: *deversorio*) in the *Satyricon*. Each narrative is noteworthy for much action and inaction on couches and beds, described with the repeated use of the nouns *lectus* and *torus*. The former appears at Propertius 4.8.27, 25 (*lectulus)* and 87 as well as *Satyricon* 21.5; the latter at Propertius 28 and 88 as well as *Satyricon* 17.1, 18.2, and 22.4. In each we find drinking in abundance; faltering lamps and crashing tables; a focus on eyes and

---

[16] See, for example, the sounds of doors and laughter referred to in note 10 above. Cf. also Propertius 4.8.60 (*omnis et insana semita nocte sonat:* "and the entire thoroughfare resounds in the mad night"); *Satyricon* 18.7 (*complosis manibus:* "with hands clapped together"); 20.6 (*complosit manus:* "she clapped her hands together"); 22.4 (*ad quem ictum exclamavit*: "at which blow she shouted"); and 22.6-23.2 (*cymbalistria et concrepans aera omnes excitavit:* "the cymbal player, also striking bronze together, aroused everyone.").

eye action–as well as on urban, citified action and speech. Both narratives, too, feature the calling of neighbors referred to as Quirites; the verb *admittere*, to confess, used for confessions of bad behavior; and efforts at multiple sexual couplings.[17]

Many of the same words and verbal themes figure in both. The verb *audeo*, to dare, occurs at Propertius 4.8.22, the noun *audacia*, daring, at *Satyricon* 17.4; the verb *palleo*, to pale, at both Propertius 4.8.9 and 54, the adjective *pallidus*, pale, at *Satyricon* 16.2. We find *annus*, year, at Propertius 4.8.8 (the adjective *annua*) and 14 and at *Satyricon* 17.9 and 25.2 and 5; *cadere*, to fall, at Propertius 4.8.53 and *Satyricon* 16.2; and *effundere*, to pour, at Propertius 4.8.18 and *Satyricon* 18.1 and 7. So, too, *lenire*, to lighten, occurs at Propertius

[17] Drinking in abundance: Propertius 4.8.30, 37-8, and 53-4; *Satyricon* 20.6 (with *bibam, ebibisti,* and [*quicquid satyrii*] *ebibit*), 21.6-7 (*vino etiam Falerno inundamur:* "we are drenched also in Falernian wine"), and 23.1 (*Quartilla ad bibendum revocavit:* "Quartilla called us back to drinking"). Faltering lamps and crashing tables: Propertius 4.8.43-4 *sed neque suppletis constabat flamma lucernis / reccidit inque suos mensa supina pedes:* "but the flame was not sufficient for the filled lamps / and the table fell backwards on its own feet"); *Satyricon* 22.3-4 and 6 (*lucernae quoque umore defectae tenue et extremum lumen spargebant…cecidit etiam mensa cum argento…lucernis occidentibus oleum infuderat*: "the lamps also, devoid of moisture, were sprinkling a thin and dimming light…the table fell, along with the silver …he had poured oil into the dimming lamps"). Focus on eyes and eye-action: Propertius 4.8.55 (*fulminat illa oculis:* "she glared like lightning with her eyes") and 66 (*praecipueque oculos, qui meruere ferit:* "and in particular she struck my eyes, which deserved it"); *Satyricon* 17.2-3 (*flevit… lacrimas ad ostentationem doloris paratas,* "she wept…tears prepared for the display of grief"), 18.1 and 4 (*lacrimas rursus effudit,… et ex lacrimis in risum mota:* "she again poured out tears...and having been moved from tears into laughter"), 19.6 (*mors non dubia miserorum oculos coepit obducere*: "certain death began to cover over the eyes of us poor men"), 22.6 (*detersis…oculis:* "after eyes were wiped") and 26.4 (*applicuerat oculum curiosum:* "she had applied a fascinated eye"). Urban, citified, action and speech: Propertius 4.8.75-8 (*Tu neque Pompeia spatiabere cultus in umbra*: "you will not stroll in the Pompeian shade all dressed up"); *Satyricon* 16.4 (*iuvenes tam urbanos:* "such sophisticated young men") and 24.2 (*urbanitatis vernaculae fontem:* "a fountain of homegrown sophistication"). Calling of neighbors referred to as *Quirites*: Propertius 4.8.59 (*lumina sopitos turbant elata Quirites*: "the lifted lamps disturb the slumbering citizens") and *Satyricon* 21.1 (*cupienti mihi invocare Quiritum fidem:* "to me desiring to call upon the trustworthiness of citizens"). The verb *admittere* used for "to confess bad behavior": Propertius 4.8.73 (*admissae…culpae:* "of acknowledged fault") and *Satyricon* 17.6 (*admisistis*) and 20.1 (*admisimus*). Efforts at multiple sexual couplings: Propertius 4.8.17-18 (*unus erat tribus in secreta lectulus herba / quaeris concubitus? Inter utramque fui*: "there was one little couch for three in a secluded lawn / you ask about our lying together? I was between the two women") and 47-8 (*cantabant surdo, nudabant pectora caeco:* "they were singing to a deaf man, they were baring breasts to a blind man") and *Satyricon* 21 and 24.

4.8.33 and *Satyricon* 17.8; *spargere*, to sprinkle, at Propertius 4.8.40 and *Satyricon* 22.2 and 3; and *superbus*, proud, at Propertius 4.8.82 and *Satyricon* 17.3. Finally, just as Propertius' poem readily lends itself to staging as a comic routine, so does Petronius' episode. Both texts are developed dramatic scenes containing much descriptive information about the setting, gestures and dialogue.

Nevertheless, the Petronian episode portrays its narrator Encolpius as in very different erotic circumstances from those in which Propertius places himself. It represents his woman partner (whom Encolpius twice—at *Satyricon* 20.1 and 24.1—calls by the elegiac term for mistress, *domina*) as engaged in a very different religious activity from that occupying Cynthia. Quartilla's ritual requires energetic erotic performance: it is an all-night vigil in honor of the phallic god Priapus, whom she claims the narrator has offended (*Satyricon* 17.8: *ne scilicet iuvenili impulsi licentia quod in sacello Priapi vidistis vulgetis*: "so that you may not, driven by youthful misbehavior, publicly disclose what you have seen in the little shrine of Priapus"; 21.7: *cum sciatis Priapi genio pervigilium deberi*, "since you know that an all-night vigil is owed to the divine spirit of Priapus"). It takes place on Encolpius' premises, and includes his former lover Ascyltos and current boy lover Giton as well as himself. Like Propertius' attempted couplings with the two female prostitutes, the multiple couplings in which Encolpius has the opportunity to participate at *Satyricon* 21.2 and 23.4-5 also remain unconsummated, but they are forced on him by *cinaedi*, aggressively pathic males.

Encolpius resembles Propertius in having to vie with another man for his woman's attention (or perhaps two men, if we count the *cinaedus* whom Quartilla may or may not penetrate with a whalebone rod at *Satyricon* 21.2).[18] But this rival is someone who should hardly qualify as sexual competition: his own boy lover Giton. And while Quartilla toys with Giton's physical assets (24.7: *pertrectato vasculo tam rudi*: "after his little vessel, so unpracticed, had been rubbed up and down"), she postpones taking him on as an actual partner until she has made him deflower a seven-year-old girl in a mock wedding

[18] Petronius' description—*donec Quartilla balaenaceam tenens virgam … iussit infelicibus dari missionem*: "until Quartilla, holding a whalebone staff…ordered that release be given to the unfortunate people"—could of course mean that Quartilla merely dismissed Encolpius and his companions from their engagement with the *cinaedus* by waving the whalebone rod. But it may also imply that she satisfied the *cinaedus*' aggressive demands for anal penetration with this phallic implement.

ceremony. Petronius has Encolpius describe her in 26.4 as lusty, *libidinosa*; portray these doings as a "children's entertainment", *lusus puerilis*; and note that they observe "through a crack naughtily made through the door" (*per rimam improbe diductam*). Nevertheless, Encolpius is not aroused. Indeed, although Giton and the seven- year-old girl have no difficulties consummating their union, Encolpius cannot perform at all. He is not beaten or bashed or bitten by Quartilla, merely kissed (26.5: *commovebat obiter labra et me tamquam furtivis subinde osculis*: "in passing she moved her lips and then as if with secret kisses [assailed] me"). But he depicts these kisses (with the verb *verberare,* to lash) as tantamount to whipping.

And in addition to suffering from impotence throughout the episode (*Satyricon* 19.3: *ego autem frigidior hieme Gallica factus*: "however I, made chillier than a Gallic winter"; 20.2: *sollicitavit inguina mea mille iam mortibus frigida*: "she paid attention to my groin, now cold with a thousand deaths"; 23.5: *super inguina mea diu multumque frustra moluit* " he labored long and hard and in vain over my groin"), Encolpius is repeatedly paralyzed by fear. Quartilla's tears (which quickly turn to laughter), her worry about tertian fever, and her legally and militarily phrased demands frighten him (18.2 and 7: *misericordia turbatus et metu* and *ut timeremus*: "shaken up by pity and fear" and "we were afraid"). He represents the female trinity of Quartilla, her maid and the seven-year-old girl as terrorizing him and his two male companions (*Satyricon* 19.4-6: *sed ne quid tristius exspectarem, comitatus faciebat … et mors non dubia miserorum oculos coepit obducere*: "But our comradeship prevented me from expecting anything more tragic … and a certain death began to cover over the eyes of us poor men"). Whereas Propertius portrays Cynthia's sexual aggression, brutal physical violence, and total control of their circumstances as physically empowering to him, rendering him capable of enhanced erotic performance, Petronius has Encolpius portray himself as a most un-Propertian lover and hence literary figure.

Earlier I referred to Petronius ambiguously, as having his narrator Encolpius evoke Propertius 4.8, and thereby parody and challenge several elegiac conventions. But who is parodying? Who is challenging? When Petronius has Encolpius recall Propertius when Encolpius is narrating his own circumstances in the Quartilla episode, I would certainly contend that Petronius also has Encolpius

challenge certain elegiac conventions, most notably the justifications that elegiac poets such as Propertius provide for cruel mistreatment by their beloved. The reaction assigned to Encolpius by Petronius is, I would maintain, one form of resisting the assumptions of earlier literary texts. Encolpius is not only intimidated by the sexually aggressive, dramatic behavior exhibited by Quartilla, but imagines it as more threatening to his well-being than it apparently is (by, for example, portraying the attentions of the three women as a full-fledged military attack at *Satyricon* 19.4-5). Still, as Conte reminds us, it is Petronius who supplies the parodic element in the narrative by making Encolpius' exaggerated, inappropriate reaction so laughable ([1996] 49 ff.). It is Petronius who provides powerful resistance to a traditional elegiac literary assumption, by re-energizing it only to render its first person narrator and male dramatic protagonist so ridiculous.

In challenging Michel Foucault's interpretation of how male homoeroticism is represented in Roman literary texts, Daniel McGlathery regrets Foucault's "limited view of parody as a derivative exercise, a petty or pejorative imitation of an original rather than a creative or fertile artistic response" ([1998] 206). Parodic responses may, moreover, adopt moral and political stances as well as exhibit artistic creativity and fertility. After several years of serious left-wing political activity, including an unsuccessful campaign as a Labour candidate for parliament in 1964, the late, great British television and screenwriter Dennis Potter came (in the words of his biographer Humphrey Carpenter) to the conclusion that "direct action of this sort will never succeed." Potter sought instead, through brilliantly allusive, often parodic dramatic writing, "to find a different language for understanding and tackling the mess that is human nature." In 1968, Potter even criticized a political journal edited by increasingly left-leaning friends for its tired, dull tone. "It needs," Potter opined, "an aggressive gaiety, a cool irony, a cynicism tempered by bold optimism, a rumbustious vulgarity, a sense of the surrounding hypocrisy and the wit to draw on the real experiences of its [audience]" (Carpenter [1998] 216-17, 248-9). Potter not only followed this prescription for a vibrant, dynamic form of political discourse in his own screenplays. He followed Petronius in so doing.

But what kind of politics, what kind of moral attitude lies behind Petronius' parodic resistance to elegiac assumptions about female

sexuality, and male responses to it? I view as feminist, or at least as socially subversive and radical, the representation, by Propertius and other male and female elegists, of women as more desirable when they exercise autonomy in regard to whom they desire, and to how they express these desires physically (Hallett [1973]). By parodying, and resisting, this assumption, therefore, by creating a certain amount of sympathy for Encolpius even as he ridicules him, Petronius is here reinforcing traditional, conservative, patriarchal (and some might even say misogynistic) assumptions about female, and male, sexual conduct. These, of course, are assumptions that enabled Roman verse satirists such as Horace and later Juvenal to represent normative, and abnormal, female and male sexuality as they do. And by deploying resistance to challenge feminist, rather than masculist, assumptions, by enabling those who would deny women sexual agency and autonomy to speak more authoritatively, Petronius problematizes certain assumptions about literary resistance itself, reminding us that it can serve reactionary as well as radical purposes.

I follow the *Satyricon* text of Konrad Müller (1965) as well as the Teubner text of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* by William S. Anderson (1977), and the Oxford Classical texts of Horace (Wickham, 1900) and Propertius (Barber, 1960). All translations are my own. My deepest appreciation to numerous "enablers" for their support on this project: Donald Lateiner, first and foremost; my students in Latin 303, Petronius, at the University of Maryland, College Park in spring semester 2000 (Kent Cartwright, Monica Collins, Mark Fowler, Stephen Murphy, Lori Musico, Ryan Shultzaberger, Pimtai Suwannasuk, Matthew Webb, Donna Welch and Ernest Williams); Gregory Daugherty (and his students and colleagues at Randolph Macon College); Monica Gale (and her students and colleagues at Trinity College, Dublin); Luigi DeLuca, Niklas Holzberg, David Scourfield, and the organizers and program committee of the Third International Conference on the Ancient Novel.

This page intentionally left blank

LA MISE EN SCENE DECLAMATOIRE CHEZ LES ROMANCIERS LATINS

Danielle van Mal-Maeder

Le premier roman latin tel qu'il nous est parvenu s'ouvre sur une violente diatribe contre les écoles de déclamation, toute faite pour préluder à cette étude:

> *Nunc et rerum tumore et sententiarum uanissimo strepitu hoc tantum proficiunt ut, cum in forum uenerint, putent se in alium orbem terrarum delatos. Et ideo ego adulescentulos existimo in scholis stultissimos fieri, quia nihil ex his, quae in usu habemus, aut audiunt aut uident, sed piratas cum catenis in litore stantes, sed tyrannos edicta scribentes quibus imperent filiis ut patrum suorum capita praecidant, sed responsa in pestilentiam data, ut uirgines tres aut plures immolentur, sed mellitos uerborum globulos, et omnia dicta factaque quasi papauere et sesamo sparsa.*
>
> Mais tous ces thèmes boursouflés, et tout ce ronron de phrases creuses, à quoi servent-ils finalement? Les jeunes gens, lorsqu'ils débutent au barreau, se croient tombés dans un autre monde. Pour tout dire ma pensée, ce qui fait de nos écoliers autant de maîtres sots, c'est que, de tout ce qu'ils voient et entendent dans les classes, rien ne leur offre l'image de la vie: ce ne sont que pirates avec des chaînes embusqués sur le rivage, tyrans préparant des édits qui condamnent des fils à décapiter leurs propres pères; réponses d'oracles à propos d'une épidémie qui ordonnent l'immolation de trois vierges ou plus encore; périodes mielleuses et mollement arrondies; bref, paroles et faits, tout est pour ainsi dire saupoudré de pavot et de sésame.[1]

S'il est une chose que la narratologie nous a apprise, c'est que le 'je' du narrateur n'est pas le 'je' de l'auteur, et cette distinction vaut aussi pour l'Antiquité. Cette remarquable tirade est prononcée par Encolpe, le héros et narrateur principal du roman, personnage peu reluisant qu'il faut se garder de considérer comme le porte-parole de Pétrone. Comme l'a montré G.B. Conte, Encolpe est lui-même un *scholasticus* victime du système qu'il dénonce et cette déclamation (comme d'autres discours dans le roman) est farcie de tics caractéristiques du

---

[1] Petron. *Satyricon* 1.2-3, texte et traduction de Ernout (1950).

genre.[2] Il se peut qu'Encolpe soit sincèrement indigné. Mais s'il faut chercher le jugement de l'auteur du *Satyricon*, c'est plutôt dans son choix de mettre en scène cet anti-héros-narrateur incarnant les effets négatifs de l'éducation nouvelle. D'ailleurs, Pétrone donne aux écoles de déclamation un avocat en la personne du compagnon d'aventures d'Encolpe, Agamemnon, dont la plaidoirie est loin d'être dépourvue de bon sens.[3]

La tirade d'Encolpe n'est pas un fait unique. Au contraire des romans que la critique antique condamnait en n'en parlant pas,[4] les déclamations furent la cible d'attaques retentissantes. On leur reprochait d'être trop éloignées du réel pour remplir la fonction pratique qui devait être la leur: enseigner l'art de la parole persuasive aux jeunes gens désireux de se lancer dans une carrière politique et juridique. L'invraisemblance des situations proposées aux élèves, le caractère stéréotypé des personnages et les boursouflures du style déclamatoire furent l'objet de critiques répétées, qui, à force de se répéter, finissent par ressembler à un exercice de style adaptable à différents genres: Sénèque le rhéteur s'y appliqua, Quintilien n'y manqua pas, Juvénal, riche de son passé de déclamateur, s'y adonna à son tour, avec plus de drôlerie que le sévère Messalla chez Tacite.[5] Encolpe est en bonne compagnie parmi la horde des détracteurs des déclamations, – en moins bonne compagnie aussi. Car une critique semblable se retrouve, exprimée avec moins d'élégance, dans la bouche du parvenu Trimalcion, dont on aurait peine à dire qu'il est le porte-parole de Pétrone. Au cours du fameux dîner qu'il donne chez lui, Trimalcion s'adresse à Agamemnon pour lui demander le sujet de sa déclamation du jour:

> *"Sed narra tu mihi, Agamemnon, quam controuersiam hodie declamasti? Ego autem si causas non ago, in domusionem tamen litteras didici. Et ne me putes studia fastiditum, tres bybliothecas habeo, unam Graecam, alteram Latinam. Dic ergo, si me amas, peristasim declamationis tuae." Cum dixisset Agamemnon: "Pauper et diues inimici erant," ait Trimalchio: "Quid est pauper?"– "Vrbane," inquit Agamemnon; et nesquio quam controuersiam exposuit. Statim Trimalchio:*

[2] Voir Conte (1996) 44 ss.; Soverini (1985) 1707 ss.
[3] Cf. Petron. *Satyricon* 3 et 4.
[4] Voir Morgan (1993) 175 ss.; Hofmann (1999) 3 ss.
[5] Voir Bornecque (1902) 117 ss.; Bonner (1949) 71 ss.; Winterbottom (1980) 1 ss. Cf. aussi Dionys. Hal. *Rhetorica* 10, cité par Russell (1981) 184 s. ; cf. aussi Synesios *De insomniis* 20.

"Hoc," inquit, "si factum est, controuersia non est; si factum non est, nihil est."

"Mais raconte-moi, Agamemnon, quelle controverse as-tu plaidée aujourd'hui? Pour ma part, si je ne plaide pas, j'ai tout de même appris la littérature pour mon usage particulier. Et ne va pas croire que je méprise les études; j'ai trois bibliothèques, dont une grecque, une autre latine. Fais-moi donc l'amitié de me dire le sujet de ta déclamation." Agamemnon commença: "Un pauvre et un riche étaient ennemis."– "Un pauvre, qu'est-ce que c'est que ça?" demanda Trimalcion. – "Délicieux!", dit Agamemnon et il exposa je ne sais quelle controverse. Mais sur le champ Trimalcion reprit: "Si c'est un fait réel, ce n'est pas une controverse; si ce n'est pas un fait réel, ce n'est rien du tout." [6]

Le conflit entre pauvre et riche est l'un des thèmes favoris des déclamations. Lorsqu'il s'agit de plaider la cause du pauvre—ce qui est souvent le cas dans les déclamations qui nous sont parvenues—le pauvre y est représenté comme la malheureuse victime du riche et ce dernier comme un personnage violent et tyrannique.[7] Cela explique peut-être la réaction du richissime Trimalcion, qui interrompt brutalement Agamemnon. Dans la suite de ses propos, on retrouve la critique traditionnelle selon laquelle les déclamations n'ont rien à faire avec la réalité. Mais cette critique est mise dans la bouche d'un presque illettré, qui ne fait que répéter sans le comprendre ce qu'il a pu entendre. Mieux: elle est mise dans la bouche de quelqu'un pour qui la pauvreté est en dehors de la réalité.

Les déclamations constituent l'un des matériaux intertextuels avec lequel Pétrone s'amuse. En particulier, l'auteur aime à placer Encolpe dans des situations sorties droit de l'univers déclamatoire et face auxquelles il réagit comme on le lui a appris à l'école: ainsi de la tempête, suivie du naufrage et de la mort du terrible Lychas, qui donne lieu à une déclamation pathétique sur les aléas de la vie et la cruauté de la Fortune.[8] Le roman de Pétrone a beau se faire l'écho d'un débat critique contre la pratique des déclamations, celles-ci n'en nourrissent pas moins de leur substance la trame romanesque.

On peut faire la même démonstration avec Apulée qui, dans plusieurs épisodes des *Métamorphoses,* se sert de la matière déclamatoire pour la remodeler à sa convenance. Certaines figures du roman

---

[6] Petron. *Satyricon* 48.4-6.
[7] Tabacco (1978) 1978a et 1979; Russell (1983) 27 ss.
[8] Petron. *Satyricon* 114-15: voir Conte (1996) 48 ss., en particulier 63 ss.

d'Apulée rappellent les personnages peuplant l'univers déclamatoire. En particulier, elles ont en commun avec eux l'anonymat. Ce sont, comme dans les déclamations, des silhouettes anonymes, des caractères types qui se débattent dans des conflits privés et des drames familiaux concernant des questions de propriété, d'héritage et d'adultère.

Tel est notamment le cas de l'épisode du riche et du pauvre au livre 9.33-8. Un riche propriétaire terrien, agressif et violent, cherche à s'emparer des terres d'un pauvre voisin. Ce dernier est défendu par les trois fils d'un fermier opulent, contre lesquels le méchant riche va diriger sa haine. Une bataille s'en suit, qui aboutit à la mort du riche, des trois fils et de leur père, dans une cascade de violence inouïe.[9] On aurait pu penser que cet épisode allait fournir une compensation au lecteur du *Satyricon*, frustré de ne pas avoir eu droit à la déclamation d'Agamemnon sur le riche et le pauvre.[10] Mais le conflit de base se déplace, déjouant les idées qu'on avait pu se former en entendant les mots *diues* et *pauper*. Croyant reconnaître le scénario d'une déclamation, le lecteur se rend bien vite compte que le drame familial auquel il assiste dépasse les schémas auxquels il est habitué. Le pauvre disparaît rapidement de la scène et, contrairement à ce qui se passe dans l'univers des déclamations, il semble bien qu'il réchappe sain et sauf de sa mauvaise aventure. Ce drame sanglant a finalement pour fonction d'illustrer les caprices et la cruauté de la Fortune—un thème majeur dans ce roman—comme on peut le conclure de la remarque finale de Lucius:

> *Ad istum modum puncto breuissimo dilapsae domus fortunam hortulanus ille miseratus suosque casus grauiter ingemescens...*
>
> Rempli de pitié pour le triste sort de cette maison anéantie de la sorte en un instant et gémissant fort sur son propre malheur...[11]

Plusieurs personnages féminins mis en scènes dans les récits enchâssés des *Métamorphoses* évoquent l'univers des controverses, telle la

[9] Le lien avec les déclamations est relevé par *GCA* (1995) 297 *ad* 9.35.

[10] Cf. Petron. *Satyricon* 48 (cité plus haut dans le texte) *nesquio quam controuersiam exposuit*.

[11] Apul. *Métamorphoses* 9.39.1, texte de Helm (1992), traduction de Grimal (1958).

veuve éplorée dans le récit de Thélyphron, qu'un vieillard accuse publiquement du meurtre de son mari:

> *Haec enim nec ullus alius miserum adulescentem, sororis meae filium, in adulteri gratiam et ob praedam hereditariam extinxit ueneno.*
>
> Car c'est elle et nul autre qui, pour complaire à un amant et afin de s'emparer de l'héritage, a tué le malheureux jeune homme, le fils de ma sœur, en l'empoisonnant.[12]

Ces chefs d'accusation et la situation, où un homme fait appel à la justice publique, évoquent l'univers des déclamations. Dans son accusation, le vieillard accusateur applique un principe évoqué par Sénèque le rhéteur, selon lequel un grief permet d'en prouver un autre:

> *... duo crimina, cum alterum probamus, ut id alterius fiat probatio, tamquam cum dicimus adulteram fuisse, ut credatur propter hoc etiam uenefica.*
>
> ... deux griefs, dont nous prouvons l'un, qui sert à prouver l'autre, comme lorsque nous disons, par exemple, qu'une femme est adultère, afin de donner par là l'opinion qu'elle est aussi empoisonneuse.[13]

Surtout, le livre 10 des *Métamorphoses* contient deux récits enchâssés mettant en scène des criminelles dans des drames familiaux proches de ceux qui ensanglantent l'univers des déclamations. Il s'agit d'une part de la marâtre amoureuse de son beau-fils (10.2-12), amalgame de la Phèdre tragique et du type de la *nouerca* empoisonneuse qui sévit dans l'univers des controverses.[14] L'histoire de la criminelle condamnée à copuler en public avec l'âne Lucius au milieu de bêtes féroces (10.23-8) débute d'une manière qui rappelle les thèmes des controverses; en particulier, elle présente plusieurs correspondances avec l'une des *Déclamations mineures* attribuées à Quintilien.[15] Dans ce drame familial, l'exposition d'un enfant aboutit à une cascade d'assassinats plus horribles les uns que les autres. Outre qu'ils illustrent les aléas de la Fortune et, j'y reviendrai, l'inefficacité de la justice humaine, ces récits ont pour fonction de préfigurer le change-

---

[12] Apul. *Métamorphoses* 2.27.5. La traduction est mienne: voir *GCA* (2001).
[13] Sen. *Controverses* 7.3.6, texte et traduction de Bornecque (1932).
[14] Voir *GCA* (2000) 417 ss.; van Mal-Maeder (2001).
[15] Quint. *Déclamations mineures* 306; voir *GCA* (2000) 295 ss. *ad* 10.23.

ment de registre qui s'opère entre les dix premiers livres du roman et le livre d'Isis.[16]

Ces exemples ont en commun avec les déclamations leur seule ossature. On y reconnaît des thèmes familiers et des caractères types. Mais de ce qui fait l'essence des déclamations, les plaidoyers, pas de trace.[17] Cette absence (cette omission, vaudrait-il mieux dire) est même explicitement signalée dans le texte. L'histoire de la marâtre assassine comporte un procès, durant lequel l'innocent beau-fils est jugé pour le meurtre de son demi-frère. En sa qualité d'âne, Lucius ne peut assister aux débats judiciaires et ça n'est que par ouï-dire qu'il détient ses informations:

> *Haec ad istum modum gesta compluribus mutuo sermocinantibus cognoui. Quibus autem uerbis accusator urserit, quibus rebus diluerit reus ac prorsus orationes altercationesque neque ipse absens apud praesepium scire neque ad uos, quae ignoraui, possum enuntiare, sed quod plane comperi, ad istas litteras proferam.*
>
> La façon dont tout cela se passa, je l'ai sue par de nombreuses conve rsations que j'ai entendues. Quant aux termes mêmes du réquisitoire de l'accusation, aux arguments de l'accusé pour tenter de se défendre et, de façon générale, aux discours et aux échanges de répliques survenus en mon absence, il me fut impossible de les connaître, à ma mangeoire, et je ne puis vous dire ce que j'ignore, je vais seulement exposer ici ce que j'ai appris de façon certaine.[18]

Mais la présence de l'hypotexte déclamatoire ne se résume pas à certains thèmes susceptibles de donner matière à des développements narratifs sensationnels. On trouve, comme chez Pétrone, des discours obéissant à toutes les règles du style déclamatoire. L'utilisation du matériel déclamatoire dans les *Métamorphoses* répond en outre à une logique qui n'a rien de superficiel.

Le nœud du premier récit enchâssé du roman (1.5-19) met en scène un meurtre nocturne en huit-clos caractéristique de l'univers

[16] *GCA* (2000) 417 ss. et 440 ss.

[17] Dans les romans grecs, en revanche, qui exploitent le motif du procès, les plaidoyers occupent une place non négligeable; voir van Mal-Maeder (2001) 63 n.26 avec références supplémentaires.

[18] Apul. *Métamorphoses* 10.7.3-4. Il faut souligner l'humour de cette déclaration, la pose historiographique étant appliquée à un récit dont le caractère fortement intertextuel dénonce la nature fictive; voir *GCA* (2000) 139 s.

déclamatoire et rhétorique.[19] Dans cet épisode, Aristomène raconte avoir été le témoin impuissant du meurtre de son compagnon Socrate, dans la chambre d'auberge qu'ils partageaient. Selon ses dires, les coupables étaient deux sorcières, qui usèrent de leurs pouvoirs magiques pour forcer la porte de la pièce soigneusement fermée à clef. Après avoir commis leur horrible forfait, elles s'en allèrent et la porte brisée se remit en place d'elle-même.[20] Il n'y a donc aucune trace d'infraction et selon toute logique Aristomène apparaît comme le seul responsable de ce meurtre. Face à cette évidence, il se lance dans un monologue pathétique, formé de phrases brèves et de questions rhétoriques, et va jusqu'à imaginer et à citer au discours direct les arguments de l'accusation selon une technique fréquente dans les déclamations.[21] Son récit des faits n'est pas sans évoquer les couleurs fantastiques ou irrationnelles dont les déclamateurs aiment se servir, parce qu'elles sont irréfutables.[22]

L'épisode du procès de Lucius (3.2-10) repose sur un type de situation paradoxale caractéristique des déclamations, où les deux parties ont autant d'arguments à faire valoir l'une que l'autre. L'accusé est à la fois dans son tort et dans son bon droit. Les plaidoiries pour et contre Lucius sont rapportées au discours direct. Elles illustrent de manière emblématique comment on manipule les arguments dans un sens ou dans l'autre. Notons aussi en passant l'ironie de la situation, où c'est le narrateur premier, Lucius, qui rapporte non seulement son propre discours de défense, mais aussi celui de son accusateur. Lu-

[19] Cf. e.g. Ps. Quint. *Déclamations majeures* 1 et 2 (un homme est tué dans son lit, à côté de sa femme, tous les indices désignent son fils comme coupable); Cic. *De inventione* 2.14 (un voyageur est accusé du meurtre de son compagnon de route dans une auberge); *Pro Roscio* 64 (un père est tué dans la chambre qu'il partageait avec ses deux fils et l'absence de signes d'infraction semble les désigner comme coupables).

[20] Cf. Apul. *Métamorphoses* 1.14.1: *Commodum limen euaserant, et fores ad pristinum statum integrae resurgunt: cardines ad foramina resident, ad postes repagula redeunt, ad claustra pessuli recurrunt* (Elles venaient à peine de franchir le seuil que les battants de la porte se remettent en place, intacts; les pivots s'introduisent dans leurs logements, les barres s'enfoncent dans le chambranle, les verrous retournent dans les gâches).

[21] Dans l'*argumentatio*, pour procéder à une *refutatio*. Pour les parallèles linguistiques et stylistiques que ce passage présente avec les déclamations, voir Keulen (2003) ad loc.

[22] Voir van Mal-Maeder (à paraître). Les couleurs (*colores*) sont les motivations particulières prêtées aux personnages mis en cause, sur lesquelles jouent l'accusation et la défense.

cius qui, faut-il le rappeler, devient, à la fin de ses aventures, avocat, un avocat célèbre, qui connaît un grand succès sur le forum.[23]

Le procès se déroule dans le théâtre de la ville, selon une pratique attestée dans certaines villes de Grèce.[24] Mais le théâtre est avant tout un lieu de spectacle et de divertissement, et il fut aussi l'un des endroits publics qui accueillirent les déclamations lorsqu'elles se firent exhibitions destinées à amuser un auditoire plus large que celui des écoles.[25] Dans l'épisode des *Métamorphoses*, Lucius est consterné de voir que la foule venue assister à son procès est secouée par le rire et qu'elle trouve sa défense particulièrement délectable. C'est que ce procès n'est qu'une mise en scène, une immense farce ayant pour cadre la fête du Rire. Il a notamment pour but d'illustrer à l'intérieur de la trame romanesque la métamorphose que connaissaient les déclamations, passant d'une fonction essentiellement pédagogique à une fonction de divertissement. La foule d'Hypata venue s'amuser à écouter les gymnastiques mentales et verbales de Lucius est le reflet du type de public qu'attiraient les rhéteurs et leurs déclamations. Ce procès n'est qu'une immense farce, car l'affaire criminelle pour laquelle Lucius est jugé n'est que du vent. Lucius n'a pas trucidé trois citoyens d'Hypata, il a trucidé trois outres gonflées. On a là en quelque sorte la métaphore de ce qu'étaient devenus les procès fictifs des controverses, si l'on en croit les critiques des Anciens: du brassage d'air et de paroles sur des thèmes absurdes et creux, qui n'avaient plus rien à voir avec la réalité des vrais procès.

Comme la majorité des passages où transperce l'intertexte déclamatoire, cet épisode met en relief le motif de la fausse accusation et celui de l'impossibilité de prouver l'innocence ou la culpabilité d'un accusé, c'est-à-dire de l'impossibilité d'établir la vérité.[26] Lucius est accusé du meurtre de trois citoyens, alors que tout le monde sait qu'il n'a tué personne. Et s'il se sort finalement de ce mauvais pas, ce n'est certainement pas parce qu'il a su prouver son innocence par sa

[23] Cf. Apul. *Métamorphoses* 11.28.6: *quae res summum peregrinationi meae tribuebat solacium nec minus etiam uictum uberiorem subministrabat, quidni, spiritu fauentis Euentus quaesticulo forensi nutrito per patrocinia sermonis Romani* (Et j'y puisais une immense consolation à mon exil et cela, en même temps, me valait une existence moins restreinte car, grâce au bon vent qui me portait, j'obtins quelques petits profits au barreau en plaidant dans la langue des Romains).

[24] Colin (1965) 342 s.

[25] Russell (1983) 74 ss.

[26] Voir *GCA* (2000) 396 ad 10, 33; Gleason (1999).

plaidoirie, si habile fut-elle. De manière similaire, la mésaventure d'Aristomène fait de lui un coupable aux yeux du monde rationnel et le récit qu'il en fait ne convainc personne en dehors de Lucius. L'affaire de la méchante marâtre au livre 10 illustre aussi l'idée de la vanité des procédures judiciaires. Car si les discours pour et contre le beau-fils accusé par sa marâtre sont omis, ça n'est pas uniquement parce que Lucius a la bonne conscience de faire un récit tout à fait véridique.[27] C'est aussi parce qu'ils ne prouvent rien du tout:

> *Simul enim finita est dicentium contentio, ueritatem criminum fidemque probationibus certis instrui nec suspicionibus tantam coniecturam permitti placuit atque illum potissimum seruum, qui solus haec ista gesta esse scire diceretur, sisti modis omnibus oportere.*
>
> Dès que fut terminé le duel oratoire, on décida d'établir la vérité et la sincérité des accusations par des preuves certaines et de ne pas se borner à des conjectures et des soupçons, en aussi grave matière, et, par conséquent, de faire comparaître, avant tout et à tout prix, l'esclave en question, qui, disait-on, était seul au courant de la façon dont s'étaient passées les choses.[28]

Les juges se laissent aisément convaincre par la version des faits de l'esclave roublard. L'épisode illustre l'aisance avec laquelle la justice peut être bafouée et l'inutilité de ses moyens pour établir la vérité: non seulement les plaidoiries ne prouvent rien, mais la torture elle-même se révèle inefficace. C'est finalement grâce à l'intervention d'un brave médecin, instrument de la Fortune et de la divine Providence, que la culpabilité de la méchante belle-mère est révélée et que le jeune homme est délivré de la fausse accusation.[29] De façon similaire, l'accusation publique dans le récit de Thélyphron au livre 2 ne trouve pas sa résolution dans l'application du système judiciaire. La vérité est rétablie grâce à un autre *deus ex machina*: le nécromant Zatchlas, qui invoque le témoignage du mari assassiné, ressuscité

---

[27] Ailleurs, en effet, Lucius ne s'embarrasse pas des limites de la perspective. Juste après s'être excusé de ne pas pouvoir donner un compte-rendu exact des débats judiciaires, Lucius reproduit au discours direct le long discours tenu par le médecin devant les sénateurs (10.8.2-9.5). Auparavant, il avait cité les paroles de la marâtre prononcées dans le secret de sa chambre (10.3.5-6).

[28] Apul. *Métamorphoses* 10.7.5-6.

[29] Apul. *Métamorphoses* 10.12.5: *et illius quidem senis famosa atque fabulosa fortuna prouidentiae diuinae condignum accepit exitium* (Et l'aventure de ce vieux père, aussi célèbre qu'incroyable, eut un dénouement digne de la providence divine).

pour la bonne cause.[30] Dans le cas de la tueuse en série du livre 10, la justice n'entre en action pour mettre un terme à ses crimes que quand une de ses victimes vient les révéler au procureur, prouvant ses accusations par sa mort.[31]

Le but des déclamations n'était pas de chercher à établir la vérité, il était d'apprendre à gagner un procès en justice. L'utilisation de la matière déclamatoire dans les *Métamorphoses* confirme le premier fait et expose la vanité du second, s'il est vrai qu'on assiste dans ces épisodes au triomphe de la justice poétique sur la justice humaine. Il ne faut pas pour autant voir là une critique contre la pratique des déclamations. Les déclamations sont l'un des matériaux formant le tissu intertextuel des *Métamorphoses,* qu'Apulée s'amuse à transformer pour fabriquer ce genre nouveau qu'est le roman. Il était d'ailleurs inévitable qu'un genre de prose admettant la fiction et la liberté d'invention généralement réservées à la poésie et faisant grand usage de la langue poétique puisse lui servir dans ses 'manipulations génériques.'[32] Les déclamations avaient évolué: conçues à l'origine comme des exercices d'école, elles étaient devenues des oeuvres de divertissement (para)littéraires à l'attention d'un public d'adultes amateurs du genre.[33] En s'appropriant la matière déclamatoire, Apulée comme Pétrone lui reconnaissent ses capacités épidictiques.

Les déclamations, dans lesquelles règne la violence (violence des conflits et des relations), offrent la possibilité de développements sensationnels en rapport avec les thèmes principaux du roman (caprices de la Fortune, cruauté humaine, injustice, divine Providence). Elles offrent aussi à Apulée la possibilité de rivaliser avec elles. On l'a vu plus haut, la critique antique reprochait aux déclamations leur caractère invraisemblable et leur inutilité, les reléguant du côté du non-réel et de la fiction. Dans les épisodes où transperce l'hypotexte déclamatoire, l'auteur des *Métamorphoses* s'adonne à une surenchère de violence et pratique l'exagération, n'hésitant pas à faire intervenir le surnaturel et le fantastique. De la sorte, il démontre qu'il sait faire aussi bien que les déclamateurs en matière d'invention et d'invraisemblance. Mais en même temps, du fait qu'il se sert des déclamati-

---

[30] Apul. *Métamorphoses* 2.28-30. La démonstration de Zatchlas ne fournit cependant pas une preuve directe de la culpabilité de l'épouse. De plus, le témoignage d'un mort est loin d'être absolument fiable: voir *GCA* (2001) 383 et 385 ss.

[31] Apul. *Métamorphoses* 10.28.3-5.

[32] Voir *GCA* (2001), 26 ss.

[33] Bornecque (1902) 44 ss.; Bonner (1949) 39 ss.; Winterbottom (1980) 12 ss.

ons et les intègre dans l'univers fictif des *Métamorphoses,* il leur reconnaît un autre réalisme, un réalisme qui soit en accord à la réalité romanesque. Et c'est ainsi que la fiction des déclamations trouve finalement sa raison d'être dans la fiction des romans.[34]

[34] Dans le troisième roman latin que nous avons conservé, l'histoire du roi *Apollonius de Tyr,* l'intertexte déclamatoire est aussi présent, tant au niveau thématique que linguistique. En particulier, l'épisode de Tarsia dans la maison close (34-6) présente des ressemblances frappantes avec l'une des controverses de Sénèque le rhéteur (Sen. *Contr.* 1.2). Voir Panayotakis (2002), 107 ss.

This page intentionally left blank

DER BYZANTINISCHE ROMAN DES 12.JAHRHUNDERTS ALS SPIEGEL DES ZEITGENÖSSISCHEN LITERATURBETRIEBS

Ruth E. Harder

Über die Position der Romane der Zweiten Sophistik[1] in der damaligen Literaturlandschaft können wir nur durch unsere Beobachtungen an den Texten selbst und an der zeitgenössischen Literatur gewisse Schlüsse ziehen. Die Rhetorik bestimmte die Zweite Sophistik massgeblich. Sie hatte sich weit über die Redegattungen ausgedehnt und die meisten Textsorten durchdrungen. Ihre Bedeutung zeigt sich auch in den Romanen der Zeit sehr deutlich. Wir wüssten gern mehr über die Haltung der Autoren zur Rhetorik als sich aus den Texten herauslesen lässt. Es fehlen uns jedoch biographische Informationen und weitere Werke der Romanautoren, um präzise Antworten auf die Fragen zu finden.

Im Gegensatz zur Zweiten Sophistik ist die Quellenlage im byzantinischen 12.Jh. für eine solche Fragestellung wesentlich besser, so sind drei der vier Autoren der uns erhaltenen Liebesromane historisch gut fassbar, kannten sich und haben uns weitere Werke hinterlassen. Die Diskurslinie der Rhetorik manifestiert sich in den byzantinischen Romanen der Komnenenzeit noch deutlicher als in ihren antiken Vorbildern. Im byzantinischen Reich des 11./12.Jh. war eine Karriere ohne eine solide und über die Alphabetisierung hinausgehende Ausbildung weder in der kirchlichen noch in der kaiserlichen Administration möglich. Diese Ausbildung bestand aus Grammatik, Rhetorik und—dies allerdings nur noch für einen kleinen Teil der Studenten—auch aus Philosophie, Mathematik, Musik und Astronomie. Es lässt sich feststellen, dass in dieser Zeit mehr Leute einen guten Ausbildungsstand erreichten als die kaiserliche oder kirchliche Administration beschäftigen konnte. So entstand eine Schicht von Gebildeten, die sich selbst über die durchlaufene Ausbildung defi-

[1] Der Begriff ‘Zweite Sophistik’ geht auf Philostrat (*Vitae Sophistarum* 481 Kayser) zurück, dazu Anderson (1990). Zum literarischen Feld, in das sich auch die meisten uns ganz erhaltenen Romane einordnen, vgl. Reardon (1971) und Anderson (1989, 1993). Es besteht in der Forschung weitgehend Einigkeit, dass das 2.Jh.n.Chr. einen Höhepunkt in dieser Entwicklung darstellt.

nierte und mehrheitlich literarisch, aber auch philosophisch, theologisch und naturwissenschaftlich tätig war. Viele dieser Leute schafften früher oder später den Sprung in die kirchliche oder kaiserliche Administration. Eine ansehnliche Gruppe musste sich jedoch nicht nur vorübergehend sondern zeitlebens mit unsicherer Lehrtätigkeit und mit Auftragsarbeiten, die von Mäzeninnen und Mäzenen angeregt oder bestellt wurden, den Lebensunterhalt verdienen. Die Auftragsliteratur ist ein typisches Kennzeichen der Komnenenzeit: Einerseits besteht sie aus wissenschaftlichen oder literarischen Werken ohne klar definierten Verwendungszweck, dann aber auch aus Gebrauchsliteratur, die von der Dynastie der Komnenen vermehrt zur Herrschaftsinszenierung eingesetzt wurde, so dass der Bedarf an Reden, Gedichten und Hymnen, die für spezielle Anlässe benötigt wurden, fast exponentiell wuchs. Solche Texte haben sich ebenfalls reichlich erhalten. Die Literaten, die mehrheitlich in Konstantinopel arbeiteten, scharten sich um aristokratische Förderinnen und Förderer und bildeten sogenannte '*theatra*', die sich mit den neuzeitlichen literarischen Salons durchaus vergleichen lassen, wo sie ihre Arbeiten vortrugen und zur Diskussion stellten. Die '*theatra*' dienten gleichzeitig auch als Bühne für die Demonstration des eigenen Könnens, was sich dann wiederum in Empfehlungen für Verwaltungsposten oder in weiteren Aufträgen auszahlen konnte. Es war jedoch nicht so, dass die Kommunikation einseitig auf die Mäzenin oder den Mäzen konzentriert war, sondern die Gebildeten waren unter sich gut vernetzt und tauschten sich rege aus, was sich unter anderem an den zahlreichen erhaltenen Briefkorpora ablesen lässt.

Gattungsexperimente

Ab dem 11.Jh. begannen die Literaten wieder vermehrt mit Gattungen zu experimentieren: Manche Reden sind nicht mehr klar den zum Beispiel im Handbuch des Rhetors Menander beschriebenen Redetypen zuzuordnen, sondern kombinieren zwei Typen.[2] Dasselbe Thema kann in verschiedenen Formen abgehandelt werden, es gibt also keine klare Zuordnung eines Themas zu einer Form mehr. Hierzu gehört

[2] Zum *Epitaphios* des Michael Psellos (11.Jh.) auf seine Mutter als Gattungsexperiment vgl. Criscuolo (1989) 32ff., 37 und Hinterberger (1999) 41-3, zu einem Experiment des Michael Italikos (12.Jh.) und des Eustathios von Thessalonike (12.Jh.) vgl. Agapitos (1989 und 1998b).

auch der recht freie Wechsel zwischen Poesie und Prosa, was bedeutet, dass sich die Gattung nicht mehr nur über die Form definiert, sondern den Autoren für die Behandlung eines Themas verschiedene Gestaltungsmöglichkeiten offen lässt. Diese Erscheinungen sind natürlich nicht neu, im 12.Jh. ist jedoch ihre Häufigkeit und ihre Vielfalt auffällig. So schreibt zum Beispiel Theodoros Prodromos, einer der Romanautoren, einem einflussreichen Freund eine Rede, um ihm zur Ernennung zum *Orphanotrophos*, einem nicht unbedeutenden Amt, durch den Kaiser zu gratulieren. Gleichzeitig sind vier Gedichte des Prodromos zum gleichen Ereignis erhalten, welche die Ernennung in verschiedenen Metren und auf verschiedenen Sprachebenen in Szene setzen. Die Gattungsexperimente werden von den Autoren selbst thematisiert und dokumentieren ein klares Bewusstsein für Veränderungen und Variationen.[3]

Einen Grundpfeiler der rhetorischen Ausbildung in der Zweiten Sophistik wie im 11./12.Jh. bildeten die *Progymnasmata*: Die Schüler bildeten ihre sprachliche Ausdrucksfähigkeit und rhetorische Kompetenz anhand einer Reihe von immer anspruchsvolleren Übungstexten aus, die sie anhand vorgegebener Themen und Strukturen verfassten. Neben den Handbüchern über diesen Übungsgang sind uns verschiedene spätantike und byzantinische Beispielsammlungen solcher Übungstexte erhalten.[4] Einige der Textsorten, wie zum Beispiel die *Ekphrasis*, entwickelten sich sogar zu eigenständigen literarischen Kleinformen. Eine dieser Sammlungen, die ein Zeitgenosse unserer byzantinischen Romanautoren verfasste, enthält viele Stücke mit erotischen Themen.[5] Wie auch weitere Quellen zeigen, ist die Erotik ein zeittypischer Aspekt der literarischen Produktion.[6] Wenn man in den drei vollständig erhaltenen byzantinischen Romanen diejenigen Passagen lokalisiert, die einzelnen *Progymnasmata* entsprechen, überrascht die dichte Abfolge dieser Textstücke. Sie

---

[3] Migne, *PG* 133.1268-74, in Hörandners Werkverzeichnis des Prodromos als Brief 91 aufgeführt (vgl. auch Brief 92 = *PG* 133.1280-2 zum Ernennungsfest), und die sich daran anschliessenden *Historischen Gedichte* (=*HG*) 56.a-d Hörandner, 56a verweist auf eine *Schede* und einen ‘Prosatext’, mit denen die Ernennung bereits gefeiert wurde, und geht auf die Versmasse Iambus, Hexameter und Anakreonteen ein, in denen das Ereignis anschliessend (*HG* 56b-d) gepriesen wird.

[4] Vgl. die grosse, unter dem Namen des Libanios erhaltene Sammlung (Förster [1915]) und als Beispiel aus der Komnenenzeit Nikephoros Basilakes, *Progymnasmata* (ed. Pignani).

[5] Nikephoros Basilakes, *Progymn.* 12, 19, 30, 32, 43, 46-8, 51, 54, 56 Pignani.

[6] Vgl. dazu Magdalino (1992) 200.

sind zahlreicher als in den antiken Romanen. Besonders häufig sind Klagen und Reden, die als *Ethopoiien* (Darstellungen fremder oder eigener Charakterzüge) zu lesen sind, weiter *Ekphraseis* (Beschreibungen von Gegenständen, Orten oder Situationen), sowie *Ana*- und *Kataskeuai* (Widerlegungen und positive Erweise), *Mythoi* und *Dihegemata* (Erzählungen). Einen Teil der Romanhandlung gestalten die Autoren also bewusst in der Form von *Progymnasmata*.

Die byzantinische Romangruppe schliesst sich von der Narrativstruktur und der thematischen Gestaltung her eng an die antiken Liebesromane—vor allem an Achilles Tatios und Heliodor—an. Daraus ergibt sich als erstes die Frage, als was für eine Textsorte die antiken Romane im 12.Jh. rezipiert wurden. Panagiotis Agapitos hat 1998 die These vertreten, dass sich die plötzliche Wiederbelebung der Gattung einerseits aus der vermehrten Beschäftigung mit der antiken Tragödie erklärt, die als dramatische Darstellung von Leiden und Unglück (‘*pathe*’ und ‘*symphorai*’) vor allem in Form von Klagen (‘*monodiai*’) verstanden wurde.[7] Die Brücke für die Verbindung von Tragödie und Roman bildet andererseits der Begriff ‘*drama*’ selbst, der als einer von mehreren Fachtermini schon von den antiken Romanautoren und dann auch in der späteren Rezeption zur Bezeichnung der Romantexte oder einzelner Romanepisoden verwendet wird.[8] Im 12.Jh. wird der Begriff ‘*drama*’ jedoch differenzierter verstanden als Agapitos dies nachzeichnet, und neben dieser einen werden andere Linien im Gattungsdiskurs ebenso wichtig, so zum Beispiel das Epos und die Bukolik.[9] Dass drei der vier Romane in Versen geschrieben sind, weist nicht notwendig auf eine Ableitung von der Tragödie hin, da im 12.Jh. viele Gattungen sowohl in Prosa als auch in Versen gestaltet werden konnten, und die Autoren in diesem Bereich gern experimentierten.

[7] Agapitos (1998a), vgl. aber auch Paulsen (1992) zu Heliodors auffälliger Verwendung der Theatermetaphorik.

[8] Marini (1991).

[9] Johannes Tzetzes (12.Jh.) spricht einerseits gewissen Theokritidyllen einen dramatischen Charakter zu (*Anekdoton Estense* 3.6 Wendel), definiert andererseits Tragödien und Komödien als szenische Dramen (‘*skenika dramata*’) und unterscheidet sie von Chordichtung (‘*skenika poiemata*’), äussert sich detailliert zur Bühnengestaltung und zu den Bewegungen des Chors (*Prolegomena de comoedia* 11.a.1.119ff., 159, 11.a.2.48ff., 76ff. Koster); vgl. ähnlich schon der Anonymos, *Peri tragodias* (ed. Perusino) und Suda (ed. Adler), s.v. Moschos, dessen Werke als ‘*boukolika dramata*’ charakterisiert werden.

Die drei vollständig erhaltenen Romane des 12.Jh. zeigen individuelle thematische Schwerpunkte: In Makrembolites' Roman spielt Eros als monarchischer Herrscher eine bestimmende Rolle, viele Themen werden in Auseinandersetzung mit der bildenden Kunst entwickelt, und Träume übernehmen im Handlungsablauf eine entscheidende Rolle. Prodromos setzt in seinem Text mit epenartigen Kriegsschilderungen und mit der Darstellung von Herrschaftsinszenierung starke Akzente. Eugeneianos hingegen wählt für grosse Teile seines Romans einen bukolischen und anakreonteischen Handlungshintergrund wobei er seine Auseinandersetzung mit der antiken Literatur teilweise offen thematisiert.[10]

Die Diskurslinie der Bukolik und Anakreontik soll anhand der Gattungsrezeption im Roman des Niketas Eugeneianos genauer untersucht werden und dazu beitragen, den Romantext im zeitgenössischen literarischen Feld genauer zu verorten. Die Handlung besteht aus den typischen Segmenten Verlieben–Flucht des Paares – Versklavung auf der Reise –Bedrohung durch Rivalen – Trennung des Paares – Wiederfinden – Heimkehr und Hochzeit.[11]

Niketas Eugeneianos und Theodoros Prodromos

Der Autor Niketas Eugeneianos, ein Freund des Theodoros Prodromos, war eventuell auch sein Schüler gewesen. Die enge Beziehung der beiden Autoren spiegelt sich in Eugeneianos' Romantext, der sich direkt mit dem Text des Prodromos auseinandersetzt.

Die Auseinandersetzung spielt sich auf verschiedenen Ebenen ab: Vergleicht man die beiden Texte oberflächlich, so erweisen sich sowohl die Handlungsstruktur als auch die eingesetzte narrative Technik in beiden Romanen als sehr ähnlich. Sie orientieren sich vor allem an Heliodor. Eugeneianos scheint an vielen Punkten der Handlungsentwicklung Prodromos' Roman lediglich zu variieren.[12] Bei genauerer Betrachtung zeigt sich jedoch schnell, dass Eugeneianos im ganzen Text regelrecht gegen Prodromos anschreibt und sich von

[10] Zu diesem Aspekt allgemein vgl. Milazzo (1985) und Jouanno (1989). Zur Intertexualität und ihren verschiedenen Markierungen vgl. Helbig (1996).

[11] Hunger (1978) 2.133f. gibt eine kurze Zusammenfassung.

[12] Vgl. dazu auch die vernichtenden Urteile der früheren Forschung: Krumbacher (1897) 751, 763-5, Rohde (^{5}1974) 566f.

dessen Gestaltung absetzt.[13] Dies zeigt sich unter anderem an der räumlichen Konzeption der Handlung, wo der Autor die Natur als kultivierten, halb- oder unzivilisierten Raum ins Zentrum rückt: Der idyllische, gepflegte Dionysoshain ist der Ort, an dem der Protagonist die Protagonistin zum ersten Mal sieht und sich in sie verliebt. Auf der gemeinsamen Flucht aus der Heimat wird das Paar in einer Festgemeinde in einem anderen Dionysoshain von den Parthern überfallen und verschleppt. Dionysos als mit der Natur verbundener Gott, dem auch in symposiastischem Zusammenhang besondere Bedeutung zukommt, hat im Roman des Eugeneianos eine wichtige Stellung. Der Autor schildert die weitere Verschleppung der Gefangenen durch Araber, welche die Trennung des Paares zur Folge hat, mehrheitlich in Szenen, die sich in der wilden, unzivilisierten Natur abspielen. Das sich anschliessende letzte Drittel des Romans hat als Handlungshintergrund die Halbzivilisation, ein Bauerndorf und seine Umgebung mit seinen ungebildeten und halbgebildeten Bewohnern. Das Protagonistenpaar trifft bei einer einfachen, alten Bäuerin wieder zusammen, die es trotz ihrer Armut gastfreundlich aufnimmt. Diese Szenen erinnern an das Kleinepos ‘*Hekale*’ des Kallimachos, das in einfacher ländlicher Umgebung spielt. Die zentrale Bedeutung der Natur zeigt sich jedoch nicht nur dadurch, dass sie für den Grossteil der Handlung den Hintergrund bildet, sondern sie wird vom Autor durch detaillierte Ekphraseis zusätzlich markiert.[14]

Der Handlungshintergrund des Prodromos ist dagegen mehrheitlich zivilisiert städtisch, dies gilt auch für die Szenen, die sich bei den Barbaren abspielen: Wichtige Nebenschauplätze, die im Text viel Raum einnehmen, sind ein barbarischer Fürstenhof und eine Barbarenstadt, vor der sich zwei barbarische Heere eine Seeschlacht liefern.[15]

Eugeneianos setzt bei der Einbeziehung anderer Gattungen in den Roman dieselben Akzente wie sein Vorbild Prodromos.[16] Er baut einerseits die gleichen Textsorten ein wie Prodromos, nämlich Lieder und Briefe, sie haben jedoch völlig andere Themen und Funktionen: Während sie bei Prodromos die Herrschaftsinszenierung darstellen

[13] Vgl. dazu Agapitos (1998a) 149-55.

[14] Niketas Eugeneianos 1.77-115, 3.61-100, 4.31-40, 6.8-26, 180-201, 7.213-46 Conca.

[15] Theodoros Prodromos 4.12-29, 111-23, 5.434-6.146 Marcovich.

[16] Zur Heteroglossie, die sich als Einbeziehung anderer Gattungen in den Roman äussern kann, vgl. Bakhtin (1981) 259-422.

und mit dem Hauptthema des Romans, der Liebe, gar nichts zu tun haben, illustrieren sie bei Eugeneianos die Liebesgefühle und Werbeversuche verschiedener Romanfiguren. Eugeneianos bezieht andererseits auch Gattungen ein, die bei Prodromos nicht zu finden sind, nämlich Reihen von kleinen Reden und einzelne kleine Mythenerzählungen. Bemerkenswert ist die Art und Weise, wie der Autor die kleinen Texte in den Roman integriert: Der Freund des Protagonisten erzählt von seinen Erfahrungen mit der Liebe und zitiert wörtlich das Liebeslied und alle Liebesbriefe, die er seiner Angebeteten verehrte. Der Protagonist reagiert auf die Briefe und Schilderungen seines Freundes, indem er sie als adäquate Beschreibungen der zugrundeliegenden Gefühle lobt und ohne dies einzuleiten mit einer kleinen Erzählung zur Liebesthematik antwortet.[17] Am Fest im Dionysoshain lässt Eugeneianos die Freunde des Protagonisten mit einer Reihe von kleinen Reden die vorbeipromenierenden Frauen und Mädchen kommentieren. Aus der Situation wird deutlich, dass keine nähere Beziehung zwischen den Rezitierenden und den einzelnen Frauen besteht, genau wie am Symposium, wenn Gedichte rezitiert und Lieder gesungen werden, die zwar konkret geschilderte Beziehungen zum Thema haben, ohne dass diese real existieren müssen. Einer der jungen Männer schliesst diese Szene mit zwei Liebesliedern ab. Alle diese Reden und Lieder sind in der bukolischen oder anakreonteisch-symposiastischen Sphäre angesiedelt. Wenn man sich die Textstellen genauer ansieht, stellt man fest, dass Eugeneianos in diesen Reden, Briefen, Mythen und Liedern Teile von Theokritidyllen, ganze anakreonteische Gedichte und Epigramme aus der *Anthologia Palatina* (hier vor allem aus den Büchern mit den erotischen Epigrammen) bearbeitet und als zusammenhängende Versfolgen in seinen Text integriert.[18]

Prodromos dagegen legt die thematischen und arbeitstechnischen Akzente anders: Militärische, diplomatische und philosophische Auseinandersetzungen nehmen in seinem Roman viel Raum ein. Die in diesen Szenen geäusserten Gedanken nehmen zwar ebenfalls antike Vorbilder auf, ohne dass wir jedoch dieselbe Bearbeitungstechnik wie bei Eugeneianos finden.[19]

---

[17] Niketas Eugeneianos 2.57-385 Conca.
[18] Niketas Eugeneianos 3.51-322 Conca.
[19] Theodoros Prodromos 4.30-73, 263-308, 423-504, 5.485-503 Marcovich.

Eugeneianos inszeniert den Diskurs über Bukolik und Anakreontik in noch offensichtlicherer Form: Ein junger Dorfbewohner, der die Protagonistin für sich gewinnen möchte, präsentiert sich ihr in einer langen Werberede: Mit einem noch sehr allgemeinen Hinweis auf eine 'alte Rede' stellt er seine eigene Situation als frisch Verliebter dar. Eugeneianos legt ihm in diesem Abschnitt umgearbeitete Heliodor-Passagen in den Mund und lässt den Werbenden schliesslich Heliodors Protagonistenpaar namentlich erwähnen. Die evozierte Situation aus Heliodors Roman—es handelt sich um die Bedrohung des Protagonistenpaares durch Arsake und Achaimenes[20]—ist jedoch kein gutes Omen für das Ansinnen des Werbenden. Nachdem er kurz auf die abweisende Bemerkung der Protagonistin eingegangen ist, nennt er als Beispiel für lebenslange gegenseitige Liebe Daphnis und Chloe, die er als Vertreter eines Goldenen Zeitalters preist, während heutzutage in der Ehernen Zeit die Geliebten den Liebenden Schmerzen zufügen. Der junge Mann gibt an dieser Stelle einen Stosseufzer von sich, weil die lange Rede bei der Protagonistin noch immer keine Wirkung zeigt, und geht zum nächsten Beispiel über, zu Hero und Leander. Nachdem er deren Schicksal in enger Anlehnung an Musaios' Formulierungen kurz referiert hat, bittet er die Protagonistin, seinem vom Liebessturm geplagten Herzen Linderung zu verschaffen; das Bild des sturmgepeitschten Meeres wird als *tertium comparationis* weiter ausgeführt und schliesslich von einem weiteren Beispiel, dem Mythos von Polyphem und Galateia, abgelöst: Indem der Autor Passagen aus Theokrits 11.Idyll umformuliert, lässt er den jungen Mann das Liebeswerben des Polyphem schildern. Er schliesst eine harte Kritik an der ungerührten Protagonistin an, auf die eine Darstellung der eigenen guten Lebensverhältnisse folgt, die ihn zu einem attraktiven Bräutigam machen. Da die Protagonistin nur lächelnd zu Boden sieht, bittet er ihre Gastgeberin und Begleiterin um Unterstützung und schliesst einen letzten Redeteil an, in welchem er die Zustimmung der Angebeteten zu einer Liebesbeziehung mit der Metapher eines Gartens erbittet, in den sie ihm Einlass gewähren soll, so dass er dessen Früchte geniessen kann. Es folgt eine Klage an den allmächtigen Liebesgott, an deren Ende er das Mädchen unverblümt zum Liebesspiel auffordert. In diesem letzten Redeteil arbeitet der Autor erneut mit Epigrammen aus der *Anthologia Palatina*. Das

[20] Heliod. 7.9-8.12.

sechste Buch des Romans, das die Werberede enthält, ist gleichzeitig das längste, es ist fast um die Hälfte länger als die anderen Bücher, was seine ausserordentliche Bedeutung unterstreicht.

Die skizzierte Gestaltung der verschiedenen Ebenen des Romans zeigt den klaren Willen des Autors, der bukolischen und anakreonteischen Atmosphäre im Text durchgehend Ausdruck zu verleihen. Was die Einbeziehung von Longos betrifft, lässt sich vermuten, dass er gerade zu dieser Zeit wieder neu entdeckt wurde und von Eugeneianos nebst Theokrit und den erotischen Büchern der *Anthologia*, so wie er sie vor sich hatte,[21] bewusst gegen die Gestaltung des Prodromos mit seinen kriegerischen, politischen und philosophischen Akzenten und eventuell auch gegen diejenige des Makrembolites und Manasses gesetzt wurde. Für Eugeneianos und für Prodromos lassen sich die in ihren Romanen festgestellten Präferenzen auch in anderen Texten, die sie geschrieben haben, nachweisen.[22]

Auf die Gattungen bezogen heisst das, dass Eugeneianos literarische Kleinformen den Themen der grossen Epen, den politischen und philosophischen Debatten, die Prodromos in seinem Text inszeniert, entgegensetzt.

Dieses Ergebnis ergänzt und bestätigt die anderen Beobachtungen: Die *Progymnasmata*, die sich mit den bukolischen und anakreonteischen Themen verbinden lassen, stehen in der Übungsreihe am Anfang, sind also einfacher. Prodromos baut nicht nur mehr sondern auch komplexere *Progymnasmata*-Typen ein. Eugeneianos setzt sich jedoch dadurch von Prodromos ab, dass er antike Texte in seinem Roman namentlich kenntlich macht. Das bedeutet, dass nicht das Identifizieren der Texte, sondern ihr Einsatz im Roman zur Diskussion gestellt werden soll und der Romantext sich gleichzeitig in die evozierte Reihe von Liebesgeschichten integriert. Prodromos dagegen erwähnt lediglich an einer Stelle Homer, wo er dann ausgerechnet auf Argumente literarischer Kritik an Homers Meeresschilderungen eingeht.[23] Dieses Beispiel führt uns zu einem weiteren Aspekt

---

[21] Vgl. zur Rezeption des Longos McCail (1988) und zur *Anthologia Palatina,* wie sie Eugeneianos vorgelegen haben muss Cameron (1993) 128-9, 341.

[22] Naturbeschreibungen und -vergleiche finden sich auch in den *Epitaphien auf Prodromos* des Niketas Eugeneianos (454.28-455.8 Petit, 1b Gallavotti), in seinen Epigrammen arbeitet er Material der *Anthologia Palatina* um (Lampros [1914], Pezopoulos [1936]). Prodromos hingegen liebt Kriegschilderungen vgl. *HG* 8, 11, 16, 19 Hörandner und die *Katomyomachia* (ed. Hunger).

[23] Theodoros Prodromos 5.96-100 Marcovich.

des zeitgenössischen literarischen Lebens, der sich bei Eugeneianos noch viel deutlicher manifestiert: Der Protagonist gibt über die Liebesbriefe, die ihm sein Freund rezitiert, regelrechte literarische Urteile ab, benennt die Stärken der kleinen Texte und versucht selbst mit ad hoc-Improvisationen dagegenzuhalten. Die Urteile sind zwar knapp, ziehen sich aber durch die ganze Szene. Anstelle der Beschreibung der Wirksamkeit der Texte bei der Werbung um die Angebetete, wird die literarische Leistung diskutiert. Wir befinden uns also gleichsam in einem kleinen '*theatron*', wo Literatur präsentiert und kommentiert wird. Der Autor lässt den jeweiligen Zuhörer die Erzählungen von Erlebnissen immer wieder unterbrechen, und zwar durchgehend mit Äusserungen der Freude und Erheiterung und mit Ermahnungen, auch sicher nichts beiseite zu lassen, um die Erzählung zu verkürzen.[24] Der griechische Freund des Protagonisten scheint seine eigentliche Funktion in dieser Romanpartie des gegenseitigen Erzählens zu erfüllen, nachher gibt ihm der Autor nur einmal noch eine wichtige Botenaufgabe, bevor er ihn schnell und unspektakulär aus der Handlung wegsterben lässt.[25] Unter demselben Aspekt lässt sich auch die Werberede des jungen Dorfbewohners interpretieren: Er weiss zwar einiges über antike Literatur, schafft es jedoch nicht, sein Wissen gewinnbringend einzusetzen, das heisst rhetorisch durchdacht in seiner Rede zu plazieren. Sein Auftritt im '*theatron*' misslingt.[26]

Interessant ist nun, dass dieser Befund durch die spätere Rezeption unterstützt wird: Eine Reihe von Handschriften des 13. bis 16.Jh., die den Roman des Eugeneianos überliefern, strukturieren den Text mit *Lemmata*, die genau die oben entwickelten Aspekte berücksichtigen: Als *Progymnasmata* gestaltete Textstücke werden markiert, Bezugnahmen auf antike Vorbilder sind vermerkt, daneben auch wichtige Schritte in der Handlungsentwicklung. Dieselben *Lemmata*-Typen zeigen auch Handschriften, die den Prodromostext enthalten, sowie eine Heliodorhandschrift aus dem 11.Jh.[27]

---

[24] Niketas Eugeneianos 2.57-385, 3.51-322 Conca, eine vergleichbare Äusserung findet sich auch bei Heliodor, wo Knemon Kalasiris zur Ausführlichkeit ermahnt, dort geht es allerdings um antiquarisches Wissen (3.1-2).

[25] Der Freund des Protagonisten im Roman des Prodromos hat dagegen im ganzen Roman eine wichtige Rolle und ist fest in die Narrativstruktur integriert.

[26] Niketas Eugeneianos 6.332-643 Conca.

[27] Vgl. zu diesen Handschriften Conca (1989).

Die Position der Romane im literarischen Feld

Zum Schluss sollen nun die aus dem Text entwickelten Resultate mit der zeitgenössischen Sicht der antiken Romane und der Positionierung der Autoren im literarischen Feld in Beziehung gesetzt werden. Aus dem 11.Jh. sind uns zwei Meinungsäusserungen des Psellos zu den antiken Romanen erhalten: In einer kleinen Schrift vergleicht er Heliodor und Tatios, in einem anderen kurzen Essay äussert er sich zu einer ganzen Reihe von Autoren, unter anderem zu Heliodor und Tatios.[28] In beiden Texten schreibt er den Romanen '*charis*' und '*glykytes*' zu, die er für eine wirkungsvolle, gut gestaltete Sprache für unabdingbar hält. Um den eigenen Texten diese beiden Ingredienzien beizumischen, soll man seiner Meinung nach auf die Romane zurückgreifen. Ganz ähnlich äussert sich Gregor von Korinth, ein Gelehrter des 12.Jh., der unter anderem mehrere Kommentare zu Rhetorikhandbüchern verfasste: Auch er hält die Romane (Heliodor, Tatios, Xenophon von Ephesos) für eine lohnende Lektüre zur Verfeinerung und Perfektionierung der eigenen Sprache, ist jedoch dem Inhalt gegenüber eher negativ eingestellt.[29]

Wenn wir nun zu den Romanen des 12. Jh. zurückkehren, heisst das, dass man zwischen ihnen und der rhetorischen Ausbildung und Sprachbeherrschung eine enge Beziehung herstellen kann. Niketas Eugeneianos räumt dem Thema Liebe durch den Rückgriff auf die *Anthologia Palatina*, die Anakreonteen und die Bukolik, aber auch die Briefe des Aristainetos viel Raum ein – mehr als Prodromos. Die Bukolik wird von den Byzantinern als Mischform zwischen Drama und Erzählung rezipiert, was nach unseren Beobachtungen für den Roman ebenfalls gilt.[30] Wir können also vermuten, dass Eugeneianos mit seiner Akzentsetzung auch im Gattungsdiskurs klar Stellung beziehen wollte.

[28] Michael Psellos, Heliodorus and Achilles Tatios 29-35, 96-101 Dyck, *Peri charakteron syggrammaton tinon* 52 Boissonade.

[29] Gregor v. Korinth, *Peri syntaxeos logou*, Textes annexes 3.1.34, 35, 37 Donnet; Kommentar zu Hermogenes, *Peri methodou deinotetos*, Rhetores Graeci 7.2.1236 Walz.

[30] Vgl. dazu die verschiedenen Begriffe, die in der Suda (ed. Adler) verwendet werden: s.v. Theokrit: '*boukolika epe*', s.v. Moschos: '*boukolika damata*', vgl. ebenfalls aus dem 12.Jh. Johannes Tzetzes (*Anekdoton Estense* 3.6, 3.8 Wendel: Bukolik ist eine Mischform von '*dramatikon*' und '*dihegetikon*'.

Eugeneianos' Selbsteinschätzung

Eine der Handschriften, die den Roman überliefert,[31] enthält einen Brief des Eugeneianos an die Grammatik, in dem er diese als treibende Kraft bei der Abfassung des Romans bezeichnet, sich mit ihren Forderungen auseinandersetzt und seine bisherigen Leistungen, die er ihr verehrt hat,—unter anderem den Roman—aufzählt. Der Brief ist aufgeladen mit erotischen Formulierungen, und der Autor vergleicht sich mit Herakles im Dienste der Omphale.[32] Was erhalten wir für Informationen über Eugeneianos' Selbsteinschätzung? Am wichtigsten scheint mir der Hinweis auf die Grammatik zu sein, die im Ausbildungssystem eine der unteren Positionen einnimmt. Der Autor schreibt sich dem Bereich zu, in dem es um die Vermittlung von Sprachkompetenz auf einem höheren Niveau geht, das heisst um mehr als nur Alphabetisierung, aber noch nicht um ausgefeilte Rhetorik oder gar Philosophie.[33] Dadurch setzt er sich von Prodromos ab. In den Vers-*Epitaphien* auf seinen Freund hebt Eugeneianos dessen Meisterschaft in der Prosa und in verschiedenen Poesieformen hervor, wobei er speziell auf die Auftragsgedichte für Angehörige des Kaiserhauses bei militärischen Erfolgen eingeht. Weiter wünscht er dem Verstorbenen, dass Homer und die berühmten griechischen Philosophen ihn in der Unterwelt ehrenvoll empfangen mögen. Im Prosa-*Epitaphios* rühmt er den Freund für seine *Schedographie,* die wohl eine Neuerung im Schulunterricht darstellte.[34] Leider ist die Rede nicht vollständig erhalten, so dass wir nicht sagen können, welche Schaffensbereiche des Prodromos sonst noch zur Sprache kamen. Eugeneianos beschreibt Prodromos' Wirken in den '*theatra*' sehr genau, besonders Prodromos' literarische Kritik an Eugeneianos' Werken, von der er ungeheuer profitiert hat und die ihm schmerzlich fehlt.[35] Zusammenfassend gesagt, zeichnet Eugeneianos Prodromos nicht nur als Grammatiklehrer, sondern in erster Linie als Literat und Philosoph, dessen literarisches und wissenschaftliches Werk eine

[31] Die Handschrift wird ins 15.Jh. datiert, cf. Conca (1990) 7, Anm.1, der Brief ist bei Boissonade (1819) 2.6-12 ediert.

[32] 10 Boissonade.

[33] Zum *Curriculum* vgl. Theodoros Prodromos, *HG* 38.47-55 Hörandner.

[34] Empfang in der Unterwelt: Niketas Eugeneianos, *Epitaphios auf Prodromos* 1c.81-99 Gallavotti, *Schedographie*: *Epitaphios auf Prodromos* 461.15-462.4 Petit, vgl. auch 1b.114-22 Gallavotti.

[35] Niketas Eugeneianos, *Epitaphios auf Prodromos* 1b.112-13, 129-34 Gallavotti.

grosse thematische Spannweite aufweist, was durchaus dem Bild entspricht, das sich aus dem erhaltenen Werk des Prodromos sowie aus dessen eigenen Äusserungen ergibt. Sich selbst plaziert Eugeneianos jedoch, wie auch aus dem Brief an die Grammatik hervorgeht, auf einer tieferen Stufe.

Daraus wird deutlich, welche engen Bindungen zur zeitgenössischen sprachlichen und rhetorischen Ausbildung die Romane des 12.Jh. aufweisen und wie sie die Bedeutung der Rhetorik auf verschiedenen Ebenen dokumentieren. Sie vermitteln darüber hinaus einen lebendigen Eindruck davon, wie aktuelle Entwicklungen und Diskurse der Literaturszene aufgegriffen werden.[36] Die Autoren erachteten die Wiederbelebung der Gattung zur Inszenierung dieser Diskurse für lohnend und konnten davon ausgehen, die zeitgenössischen Rezipientinnen und Rezipienten damit anzusprechen.[37]

---

[36] Dies trifft auch auf Konstantinos Manasses zu, dessen Verschronik nicht nur im gleichen Versmass (Fünfzehnsilbler) geschrieben ist, sondern auch manche Szenen enthält, die eine erstaunliche Nähe zu seinem fragmentarisch erhaltenen Roman aufweisen, vgl. dazu Reinsch (2000). Da wir über Eustathios Makrembolites keine gesicherten biographischen Daten haben, ist sein Roman schwieriger zu beurteilen. Zu einzelnen Aspekten, die zeitgenössische Diskurse aufnehmen, vgl. MacAlister (1996) und Nilsson (2001).

[37] Ich möchte den Heruasgebern dieses Bandes für die sorgfältige Durchsicht des Manuskripts und ihre Hinweise danken.

This page intentionally left blank

STATIC IMITATION OR CREATIVE TRANSFORMATION? ACHILLES TATIUS IN *HYSMINE & HYSMINIAS*

Ingela Nilsson

It is a general assumption—or even a supposed fact—that the Byzantine twelfth-century novel *Hysmine & Hysminias* is an imitation of Achilles Tatius' *Leukippe & Kleitophon*. In order to accept such a statement it is, however, necessary to make a comparative literary analysis of the two texts in question. An attempt is made in my doctoral thesis, where I investigate the dialogue between Eumathios Makrembolites and Achilles Tatius in some detail.[1] My aim has been to treat the relation of the two novels as an intertextual dialogue rather than to consider them from the more traditional imitation perspective, which tends to emphasise the model and degrade the imitation. It is important in such a study to investigate not only which elements have been imitated and how, but also which elements have not been imitated. Byzantine imitation was not necessarily based on the principle 'one model – one copy', and Makrembolites drew from many different sources, even if *Leukippe & Kleitophon* was indeed the primary hypotext of his novel.[2]

The concept of *mimesis*, the Byzantines' own term for their particular kind of imitation of antiquity, used to be one of the main reasons for censuring Byzantine literature; the supposed compulsive imitation of antiquity was thought to make Byzantine literature unoriginal and thus uninteresting.[3] In the last twenty years or so there has been a shift in the perception of Byzantine literature, and *mimesis* is increasingly being seen not as a limitation, but as an artistic expression and an indication of literary skill.[4]

The twelfth century in Byzantium, sometimes referred to as the Komnenian renaissance, used to be considered a period of both po-

---

[1] Nilsson (2001).

[2] The concept of inter- and transtextual relations between texts was developed primarily by Gérard Genette and appears in a reworked version in Genette (1997).

[3] Jenkins (1963) is an indicative example of these views. On Byzantine *mimesis*, see Hunger (1969/70). It may be added that the high value placed on the original in contrast to the low value of the unoriginal is a relatively modern idea, which can be traced back to the mid-18th-century interest in originality and genius.

[4] See e.g. Kazhdan and Constable (1982) 114-15.

litical and cultural decline.[5] The so-called Komnenian novels were despised, judged as tedious and bad attempts at mechanically imitating the ancient models.[6] The only prose novel, *Hysmine & Hysminias* (hereafter *H&H*), was particularly unfavourably judged, being not only an imitation, but an imitation of the least appreciated ancient novel—*Leukippe & Kleitophon* (hereafter *L&K*)—which, in its turn, was for a long time considered an imitation of Heliodoros' *Aithiopika*.[7] Although the patronising attitude towards the Byzantine novels still survives among both classicists and Byzantinists, the pendulum has swung as a result of the growing interest in the ancient novels and the recent investigations of the twelfth-century literary production. The Komnenian renaissance now turns out to have been a period of literary innovation and experimentation, where ancient genres were rediscovered from new perspectives.[8]

It is of crucial importance to view Byzantine literature 'from within', that is, to consider its contemporary cultural and literary context and not see it only as an extension of antiquity.[9] On the other hand, we also need to consider the ancient predecessors, who were used as generic and stylistic models. The ancient Greek novels were read and discussed in Byzantium before the genre was 'revived' in the twelfth century, and the Byzantine novelists knew the ancient texts well.[10] Accordingly, the conventions of the ancient novels help us to understand the Komnenian texts, but we must be willing to note the differences and not only the similarities. Yes, *H&H* opens with a description of a city, and yes, the intrigue shows both traditional

---

[5] These ideas have now been at least partly rejected; see Harvey (1989), Kazhdan and Franklin (1984), and the important study by Magdalino (1993).

[6] Four novels from the Komnenian period have come down to us: Eumathios Makrembolites' *Hysmine & Hysminias*, Theodoros Prodromos' *Rhodante & Dosikles*, Niketas Eugenianos' *Drosilla & Charikles*, and Konstantinos Manasses' *Aristandros & Kallithea*; Manasses' novel survives only in fragments.

[7] *Leukippe & Kleitophon* is now usually dated to the second half of the 2nd century and the *Aithiopika* to the late 4th century, but the matter is still under debate. On the datings, see e.g. Plepelits (1996) 394-5.

[8] See e.g. the major studies on the 11th and 12th centuries by Kazhdan and Franklin (1984) and Kazhdan and Epstein (1985), and also Magdalino (1993). For a general survey of the 12th-century literary scene in Constantinople, see Nilsson (2001) 28-34.

[9] See also Harder in this volume.

[10] The Byzantines' appreciation of the ancient novels is documented above all in Photios' *Bibliotheka* and in the *Synkrisis* (*De Chariclea et Leucippe iudicium*) by Michael Psellos. For a more detailed discussion of the ancient novels in Byzantium, see Nilsson (2001) 23-4, 25-36.

features in common with Tatius and direct imitations—or rather paraphrases—of passages from *L&K*. The names are indeed, to some extent, confusingly similar to the names in *L&K*.

There are, however, distinct differences in narrative form and content: *H&H* shows extreme elaboration of some elements and complete repression of others. For example, the travel motif has been restricted to a carefully constructed series of journeys lacking the traditional adventures and burlesque comedy of *L&K*. The attention given to emotion and love, on the other hand, has been strongly emphasised in several flirtation scenes and recurring dreams. Philosophical reasoning, Platonic ideas, and discussions of love, already present to some extent in *L&K*, have been further developed in *H&H* and also contrasted to Aristotelian thoughts.

The author's tendency to use amplification and repression may be seen also from a compositional and structural point of view, in the choice of discourse: description, dialogue, and monologue have in *H&H* to a large extent replaced the more traditional narrative discourse. The modern concept of 'spatial form' illustrates nicely the techniques used by Makrembolites. Spatiality is often associated with the novel as a poem. It may be achieved, for example, through a network of recurrent motifs expressed in discourse that delays the linear development of the story, or through a pattern of forward-and-backward movement in time that plays against the chronological development. In short, any composition dominated by the recurrence and juxtaposition of motifs, words, and key themes may be called spatial.[11] The lack of action, the repetitive scheme, and the elaborated descriptions in Makrembolites' novel have been the main reasons for calling the novel bad (i.e., uneventful), but from this perspective—the concept of spatial narrativity—they are all part of a careful narrative structure.

In order to show—although briefly—Makrembolites' use of Tatius' novel, we shall look at one of the passages that he has based on a corresponding passage in *L&K*, in this case the well-known *in flagrante* scene in book 2 (*L&K* 2.23-5).[12] The situation in the ancient novel is as follows: Kleitophon has persuaded Leukippe to receive

[11] The concept of spatiality was introduced by Joseph Frank in 1945; see now Frank (1991). On spatial form according to Frank and in *H&H*, see Nilsson (2001) 40-3, 141-5, 242.

[12] The following analysis is based on Nilsson (2001) 224-7, 283-5.

him into her bedroom at night. While he enters the room, the girl's mother, who sleeps across the hall, is disturbed by a dream in which she sees her daughter being attacked by a violent bandit. The violator throws her down on her back and slits her stomach. The mother, Pantheia, leaps up and runs to the girl's bedroom, but Kleitophon manages to escape.

Pantheia is, quite naturally, greatly disturbed. She hits Leukippe's chambermaid Kleio and then bursts into a flood of accusations. She is certain that Leukippe's virginity is now lost forever. It would have been better, Pantheia says, that the girl had been raped in wartime: "that would have been a disaster but not a disgrace, if force was used" (*L&K* 2.24.3).[13] The truth is, according to Pantheia, even worse than the dream itself: "that incision in your stomach is much more serious: he pricked you deeper than a sword could have" (*L&K* 2.24.4). She does not believe Leukippe's assurance that her virginity is intact, and Kleitophon and Satyros decide that the only solution is to run away.

Let us now turn to the corresponding episode in the Byzantine novel. Makrembolites, instead of having the girl's mother dream, has placed the whole incident *within* a dream. The hero-narrator Hysminias is beginning to fall in love with his heroine Hysmine, and one night he experiences a series of erotic dreams (*H&H* 5.1–4). In the last dream of the sequence he stands in the garden embracing Hysmine, but when he tries to 'do something more erotic' the embrace turns into a struggle, since the girl is not completely willing. The dream is described as follows:

> While all this was going on, the girl's mother arrived and, grasping the girl by the hair, dragged her off like loot from war spoils, yelling vituperations and slapping her. I was absolutely thunderstruck, as though I had been blasted by lightning, 4 but that most aggressive of dreams did not let me remain senseless and turned Panthia's tongue into a Tyrrenian trumpet which brayed out against me and she cursed my herald's wand. 'Alas for your theatricals', she said, 'and your play-acting. Zeus and the gods! 5 The herald, the chaste youth who was crowned with laurel, who brought the Diasia to Aulikomis, who was welcomed amongst us and cherished like a god—he is a fornicator, a libertine, a rapist, a second Paris who has come to Aulikomis where he ravages my treasure, robs me of my heirloom. 6 But I've got you, you thief, you robber, sinner and despoiler of what is most beautiful! All you

[13] English translation of *L&K* by Winkler (1989); Greek text in Vilborg (1955).

> mothers who conceal your virgin treasures and keep sleepless watch over your treasures, look, I have the traitor who was masked by the laurel crown, the august tunic, the sacred sandal and his office—he put them all on like a lion skin, he invented the whole play. 7 But the sweet zephyr of Sophrosyne blew against these and convicted him of deceit and revealed what had been hidden. So the herald is no longer a herald but a robber, a brigand, a tyrant. 8 Women, let us weave a tunic of stone for the tyrant; let us paint his scenery for him, let us perfect the performance and let us publicly emblazon the tyrant with his tunic so that our actions will be an ornament for women, a bulwark for virgins and a crown for Aulikomis! *Did not women destroy the children of Aegyptus and empty all Lemnos of males*? Were not Polymnestor's eyes gouged out by women?'
> 4 She said this and instigated an army of women to action and succumbed entirely to a Bacchic frenzy and launched a campaign against my head. (*H&H* 5.3.3–5.4.1)[14]

At this Hysminias calls out to his relative and friend Kratisthenes, who wakes him up.

Although the two passages seem similar, they differ in many respects. First, as already mentioned, Makrembolites has subverted the use of the dream: instead of having the mother dream, he has placed the whole episode within one of Hysminias' dreams. The dream situation allows the narrator to dwell on the dramatic aspect of the situation. To the experiencing Hysminias (in contrast to Hysminias the narrator), Panthia is a true horror; she does not care much about Hysmine, just drags her away from the hero by the hair and slaps her, before concentrating all her wrath on Hysminias. Pantheia (in *L&K*), on the other hand, who could not attack Kleitophon (since he had already escaped) abused her daughter in harsh words, but she did not hit her; instead she slapped Kleio and dragged her by the hair.

We should note here the use of the similar names of the mothers: Tatius' Pantheia and Makrembolites' Panthia. That kind of word game is very common in Makrembolites and here the intertextual pun seems to partly replace the more burlesque situation in *L&K*. As to the vocabulary in the two passages, the laments of Pantheia were expressed in terms of robbery and war: Leukippe might as well have been raped by a soldier, she says. Makrembolites has picked up the robber theme, and amplified it so as to cover the whole speech of

---

[14] English translation of *H&H* by Elizabeth Jeffreys (forthcoming) with minor changes of my own; Greek text in Conca (1994) 499-687.

Panthia. The word robber, ληστής, was used only once in *L&K*, but Makrembolites employs both the same word and others within the same range of meaning: Panthia drags the girl from Hysminias as loot from war spoils, ὥς ἐκ λείας λάφυρον, she calls him an adulterer, a rapist, a thief, and so on. The robber imagery is also underlined by two classical allusions. Panthia brings up Heracles' lion-skin (*H&H* 5.3.6) and Paris (*H&H* 5.3.5, 5.3.8). Both allusions are appropriate in the present situation, since Heracles abducted Iole dressed in his lion-skin, while Paris, as the abductor of Helen, definitely was seen as a robber and an adulterer—both thus acted like the ostensible herald Hysminias. The hypotext, the vocabulary, and the ancient allusions are tied together by the common theme of the passage, 'the robber in disguise'.

The similarities with the hypotext are in fact limited: the name of the mother, the motif (the *in flagrante* scene), and the theme (the hero as a robber/rapist) have all been distorted and manipulated in different ways. The scene is, however, still recognisable for a learned audience, which is part of the literary, intertextual game. There are, however, some more specifically Byzantine additions to which we will turn now.

To the robber theme, Makrembolites has tied a dramatic vocabulary. Of course, the ancient novels were not devoid of tragic flavour—quite the contrary[15]—but as we shall see, Makrembolites seems to take it one step further. Panthia's threatening lament is like one drawn from a tragedy; this is signalled even before it begins: Hysminias says that Panthia's tongue is forged into a Tyrrhenian trumpet that tragically proclaims, καταтραγῳδοῦσαν, the accusations against him. The Tyrrhenian trumpet is known from several tragedies,[16] whereas the verb καταтραγῳδέω occurs also in *L&K*, but in another part of the novel. The passage in which the verb occurs in *L&K* is the speech in which the priest defends himself against Thersander's accusations (launched in *L&K* 8.8.8): '"you released", he says, "the man condemned to death."' He waxed bitterly indignant

[15] On theatrical vocabulary in *L&K*, see Agapitos (1998a) 155, n. 177. Michael Psellos considered *L&K* more 'theatrical' than the *Aithiopika*; see his *Synkrisis* 14-16, 67-71.

[16] Cf. Aesch. *Eumenides* 567-8, Soph. *Aias* 17, and Eur. *Rhesus* 988-99 and *Heraclidae* 830-1; see Conca (1994) 564-5, n. 3. The *Aias*, due to its status as a Byzantine school drama and the frequent use of it in *H&H*, is, however, the most probable source for Makrembolites.

about this, calling me a tyrant and other pompous-sounding names (κατετραγῴδησέ μου)' (*L&K* 8.9.7). We should note that the word 'tyrant' is used as an insult here, just as in *H&H* Panthia accused Hysminias of being a tyrant. It is significant that the insulting use of the word occurs in the same passage as the verb καταтραγῳδέω.

After this first tragic reminiscence in *H&H* follow three allusions to Euripides' *Hecuba*. In Panthia's speech we find a quotation about the sons of Aegyptus (*H&H* 5.3.8; *Hecuba* 886–7), immediately followed by an allusion to the myth of Polymnestor.[17] Thirdly, Hysminias commands the evil dream to disappear with yet another quotation, "I dismiss this nightly vision" (*H&H* 5.5.1; *Hecuba* 72). Makrembolites frequently quotes from or alludes to tragedy, but the many allusions to the same play in this rather short passage are indeed conspicuous, particularly in combination with the use of theatrical vocabulary. Euripides' *Hecuba* is one of the plays that Makrembolites most probably knew well, since it is one of the plays of the so-called Byzantine triad. One may also note that the theme of the *Hecuba* is violent: its female characters are angry and avenging, just as Hysmine's mother appears to Hysminias. The choice of this particular tragedy is thus relevant to the novel's narrative context. Furthermore, there was a strong interest in ancient drama in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, which explains the occurrence of such a passage in a twelfth-century novel.[18]

Another intertextual layer connected with the function of the dream may be distinguished in the passage. In *L&K*, the dream of the mother triggered the action of the novel: the couple's being caught *in flagrante* caused the couple's elopement. In Tatius' enigmatic manner the dream also mirrored a coming event: the apparent sacrifice of Leukippe in Egypt (*L&K* 3.15). In *H&H*, the episode is placed within a dream, it is thus spatialised and exists on a different level. Nor has Hysminias' dream any proleptic aspect: even though Hysminias worries about what may happen, his friend Kratisthenes calms him with the Aristotelian assurance that dreams are reflections of daytime occupations, 'dreams are about your daytime preoccupations' (*H&H*

[17] See Eur. *Hecuba* 658: Hecuba must take revenge for her son's death by killing the children of Polymnestor.

[18] On ancient drama and the revival of the novel in Byzantium, see Agapitos (1998a).

5.5.4).[19] And he is right: the dream does not reflect any future event, but instead underlines Hysminias' confused feelings towards his awakening sexuality.

A reader familiar with the devices of the ancient novel may have expected Hysminias' dream to have a foreboding function, but although Tatius' motif, and even some of the vocabulary, had been adopted by Makrembolites, he moved the suspense to an inner level and thus defeated the reader's expectations. To do this with a literary allusion to Aristotle was probably a device that could be appreciated: Aristotle was read and commented on in the twelfth century, perhaps in the same literary circles that Makrembolites worked in, and there may be a reference here to some ongoing intellectual discussion.[20] The dream passage in *H&H* is thus very dense and transtextually intertwining: the novelistic hypotext is combined with arche- and intertextual links to tragedy and philosophical treatises and/or commentaries.[21] The theatrical tone correlates with the protagonists' story as a *drama*, and also with the novel as erotic fiction of a tragic character.[22] The Aristotelian references in the same passage correlate with the novel's character as a philosophical essay.[23] We may also note that the sequence discussed here is intertextual not only on a literary, but also on a sociocultural level: the interpretation and function of the dream interacts with revived philosophical ideas, which replace the late antique dream interpretations.[24] I consider these transtextual aspects of *H&H* crucial, because they make *H&H* mimetic, and at the same time original.

Even this short analysis shows that the relation between Tatius and Makrembolites is more complex than the imitation concept usually indicates. First of all, *L&K* is not a constant hypotext of *H&H*: some elements have been adopted and used for expansion, whereas

---

[19] Cf. Aristotle, *De divinatione per somnia* 463a; MacAlister (1990) 203.

[20] On the literary circle of Anna Komnena and the commentators on Aristotle, see e.g. MacAlister (1990) and (1996) 158-61.

[21] On the concept of the different forms of transtextuality (intertextuality, paratextuality, metatextuality, archetextuality, and hypertextualiy), see Genette (1997); on different kinds of transtextuality in the relation between Tatius and Makrembolites, see Nilsson (2001) 168-9.

[22] On *H&H* as an erotic *drama*, see Nilsson (2001) esp. 247-8, and note also Agapitos (1998a) 142.

[23] See Nilsson (2001) 181-6.

[24] Cf. the original connotations of the concept of intertextuality; Kristeva (1969). On late antique dream interpretation and the novel, see MacAlister (1996)

other have been excluded. Nor is *L&K* the only hypotext: other narrative settings are blended with the novelistic material, for example that of the philosophical essay or dialogue. Makrembolites activated the Hellenistic-Byzantine school tradition, from which the ancient quotations and allusions have been drawn, in the archaising context of the ancient novel, with its 'ancient' characters and surroundings.

The dialogue and part of the narrative setting in *H&H* is, however, Byzantine. One example of such a Byzantine narrative setting occurs in book 9, a dialogue between the protagonists, in which the pros and contras of men and women are expressed (*H&H* 9.23). The dialogue seems to mirror the legend of Kassia, who participated in a bride show arranged for emperor Theophilos.[25] She was chosen to be the emperor's bride, but when she gave a provocative reply to his comment on women he rejected her and chose the future empress Theodora instead. This Byzantine legend appears to be activated through the dialogue between Hysmine and Hysminias, although they express themselves in quotations drawn from ancient tragedy.[26] Makrembolites is thus archaising and 'Byzantinising' at the same time.

Makrembolites' novel offered the contemporary readership pleasure by inviting it to interpret the literary and rhetorical material that the author presented. Not as riddles, because the ancient material was well known to the readers, but as recognitions, assertions of belonging to the same cultural context. The intellectual milieu of the twelfth century allowed a close relation between authors, colleagues, and patrons, and it is in such an environment that this kind of literature is created.[27] Marcello Gigante's interpretation of *H&H* as "nothing but a literary game" and a parody is thus, in my view, exaggerated.[28] The novel is partly *constructed* as a literary game, which does not exclude other layers of meaning. Makrembolites' literary puns have artistic and creative qualities which are connected with the author's and his readers' horizon of expectation. *H&H* is composed as a medieval representation of the ancient novel, in which elements such as dreaming and psychology have been expanded, but adventure and burlesque comedy excluded. The reader of the novel is expressively

[25] On Kassia, see e.g. Afinogenov (1997) and Lauxtermann (1998); on the Byzantine bride shows, see Rydén (1985). The passage may also be compared to *L&K* 2.35-8 (the discussion on sexual intercourse with boys versus women).

[26] For a fuller discussion of the passage, see Nilsson (2001) 149.

[27] See also Harder in this volume.

[28] Gigante (1960) 169.

invited through the external addressee Charidoux[29] to view and to judge, and the function of the novel is thus based on the reader's appreciation.

It is therefore important that we move away from previous judgements of the Komnenian novels as tedious and boring. *H&H* displays a conscious dialogue both with antiquity and with its own cultural environment, and if we accept the novel's invitation we too may benefit from it.

[29] On the function of the addressee Charidoux, see Nilsson (2001) 52, 89, 154.

THE 'ENTFÜHRUNG AUS DEM SERAIL'-MOTIF IN THE BYZANTINE (VERNACULAR) ROMANCES

Willem J. Aerts

The statement that the main features of the ancient romances or 'novels' were a love story with the adventures, often in remote countries, of the persons involved before the happy ending at the end of the story was effected, is neither new nor striking. Abductions and narrow escapes occur there in all varieties and in the most extreme circumstances, as in cases of apparent murders, deaths and funerals, or (for the maidens whose faithfulness towards their beloved or husband demanded their fight to preserve their virginity) forced stays in brothels. These particular extremes are often too far-fetched for a modern sophisticated public that, on the other hand, paradoxically enough, seems to be highly fascinated by action films and science fiction movies, which show the most improbable events and situations. For the ancient reader or listener, whose securities in life were so much scantier than in our from-cradle-to-grave-secured societies, there must have been a high degree of identification with the vicissitudes of the actors in the romances.[1] Some ancient authors like Lucian, Petronius, and Apuleius created, however, such absurd and fictitious plots that their works remain fascinating, also for us, whereas others like Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus still meet approval with a public interested in stylistic matters, technique of story telling and the history of narrative skill.

It is probable that the genre of the ancient romances remained well-known in Byzantine times,[2] but it had a spectacular revival at two moments, once in the twelfth century, when Comnenian writers

---

[1] In an elaborate article Kurt Treu states that the classical romances are far from being mirrors of social reality: the presentation of certain events and/or circumstances is often anachronistic. See Treu (1989). But the degree of realism is, of course, not a necessary condition for 'identification'.

[2] A number of them was known at least through Photius's *Bibliotheca*. So e.g. the *Βαβυλωνιακά* of Jamblichus, see Rohde ([5]1974) 388 ff. Photius mentions (*Bibl.* cod. 156) Loukianos, Loukios, Jamblichos, Achilleus Tatios, Heliodoros, and Damaskios as representatives of the genre. In *Digenis Akritas* many passages are taken from Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus, see the edition of the G(rottaferrata) version by Mavrogordato (1956) 265-6. See also Aerts (1997b) 151-65; 176 ff.

started a kind of retelling ancient stories in new costumes and sceneries, mostly in a slightly adapted classical iambic trimeter;[3] a second time in the fourteenth/fifteenth centuries, when a new impulse brought the creation of the so-called vernacular romances with their characteristic fifteen-syllabic 'political' verses.[4]

In a long and interesting article, entitled '*Il motivo del castello nella narrativa tardo-byzantina*'[5] Carolina Cupane argues that only in these latter romances castles receive a specific role, under western influence, with a development by which 'castle' eventually gets an allegorical meaning, indicating no longer the '*sede di Amore*' (Amor's residence), but the 'ἄφθαρτος λειμών, *la città celeste, la dimora di Virtù*' ("the everlasting meadow, the celestial city, the dwelling of Virtue"), as Cupane states (p. 259/60). In the *Achilleïs* the castle may suggest, according to its recent editor, the late Ole Smith, the inaccessibility of the girl, being a '*dimora di Virtù*', if only for the time being. The argumentation of Cupane is based on a comparison of the romances *Callimachus and Chrysorrhoe*, *Belthandros and Chrysantza*, *Livistros and Rhodamne* with the allegorical poem of Theodoros Meliteniotes *Εἰς τὴν Σωφροσύνην* (*On Prudence*) and a similar poem *Περὶ Δυστυχίας καὶ Εὐτυχίας* (*On Adversity and Prosperity*). In these poems many features of the 'erotic' romances have been adopted, such as the descriptions of paradisiac gardens and castles. One may however ask whether one is dealing with a *development* of the idea 'castle' from romantic to allegorical application under influence of the western medieval literature, or simply with a moralistic transformation of a popular theme by a cleric. Early Christian and Byzantine literature already offer examples enough of such a moralistic application, as e.g. the *Pastor* of Hermas (2nd cent. A.D.) and the famous Romance of *Barlaam and Joasaph* (8th or 9th cent. A.D.), in which Joasaph's father has a castle built for his son to live in, in order to prevent him from getting aquainted with the miseries of life. Allegorical interpretation makes that castle appear as a symbol of the innocence of youth. As I have stated elsewhere, the position in which the poet of the so-called first book of *Digenis Ak-*

[3] See also the essays by Harder and Nilsson in this volume.
[4] Agapitos (1993) vol. II, 97-134 has tried to fill the time gap by assuming that the sequence of conception of the three first vernacular romances should be 1. Libistros (1240-1260), 2. Belthandros (1270-1290), 3. Kallimachos (1320-1340).
[5] Cupane (1978).

ritas (Z 1 in the edition of Trapp [1971], evidently much later composed than the epic itself) has placed his heroine Eudokia, who will be the mother of Digenis, derives almost certainly from the Barlaam romance, which implies an 'erotic' application of a theme taken from an allegorical, or at least non-erotic, context.[6]

Cupane starts her article with the description of the 'castle' in the romantic epic *Digenis Akritas,* (GRO) book 7. The passage describes the building of an οἶκος, a *stately home* rather than a *castle* proper, as a component of a *locus amoenus,* built by the hero Digenis himself. Cupane does not mention, however, the οἶκος of the 'general' in book 4, from where Digenis abducts his bride. From the short description of this οἶκος it becomes clear that the girl had a maiden-room of her own, such as in the later romances is more explicitly mentioned. Digenis follows in the footsteps of his father, for he, the emir, had also abducted (in the genuine book 1) the girl who became Digenis's mother. In this case, the girl is set free through the activity of her five brothers and, in a way, by the benevolence of the emir, who confesses to have hidden the girl in his own tent, but swears to have respected her virginity. Here is, *in nucleo,* the first meeting with the 'Entführung'-motif as I want to work it out in the rest of this paper.[7] Another example is provided by the same epic poem on Digenis, namely the case of the daughter of Haplorrhabdes, emir of Mepherké on the Byzantine-Syrian border.[8] For three years he has been holding a young Byzantine prisoner. The daughter falls in love with that boy, with consent of her Greek mother Melanthia. Exploiting her father's absence (he is on a military campaign), and the confusion caused by her mother's sudden death, she frees the boy and escapes together with him, taking the best horses, food, and money. This 'reversed' *Entführung* has a tragic end: the boy leaves the girl in an oasis, where she is found by Digenis, who indeed brings her back to the boy, whom he forces to marry her, but only after himself having had sexual intercourse with her. In this case the escape is again made possible by the willingness of the opposite side, who had, in principle, the power to act otherwise.

---

[6] Aerts (1993) vol. II, 19-25.

[7] It should be remarked that the element of the couple of lovers being set free through the benevolence of the person in whose power they are appears already in the *Βαβυλωνιακά* of Jamblichus, cf. Rohde (^{5}1974) 397; Photius *Bibl.* (cod. 94, Migne PG 103, 328D-329A); Habrich (1960) § 7; Sandy (1989) 787.

[8] See Mavrogordato (1956) V 1-280.

It is time now to cast a glance at the most famous example of an abduction and liberation, the *Entführung aus dem Serail*, the opera by Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, on a text, originally written by Christoph Friedrich Bretzner,[9] reworked for the opera by Gottlieb Stephanie the Younger and performed for the first time in 1782. At the opening of the play the girl Constanze is in the power of the pasha Selim, who wishes to marry her, but she is inconsolable at the loss of her boy-friend. Her servant Blonde is promised to Selim's major-domo Osmin. Blonde's lover, Pedrillo, is also a slave in Selim's palace and, of course, the antagonist of Osmin. Constanze's beloved, Belmonte, has escaped from the hands of the pirates who sold their prisoners to the pasha. In order to rescue his bride Belmonte comes to the palace where he is introduced by Pedrillo to Selim as a famous (Western) architect. The prisoners work out a plan to escape: Pedrillo will invite Osmin for a drink of some (forbidden but therefore the more attractive) wine, drugged with a sleeping pill. Osmin seems to be eliminated, but catches them escaping. Selim is very disappointed about Constanze and, to make matters worse, finds out that Belmonte is the son of the Commander of Oran who is his worst enemy. Execution of the four prisoners is threatened, but Selim is surprised by the fact that both Constanze and Belmonte ask to be put to death, provided that the other will be saved. It moves his heart and moreover he does not wish to let the son pay for evil done by the father. He lets his prisoners go.

An essential point of this play is the fact that at the end the lovers are at the mercy of the pasha, whose benevolence appears as a classical *deus ex machina*.[10] Exactly the same pattern is used in two late Byzantine vernacular romances,[11] namely in *Callimachus and*

---

[9] See on Bretzner (1748-1807), a play-writer practically forgotten now, Ersch - Gruber (1841) 457-458. In the same encyclopedia is a long article on *Entführung*, based on juridical texts from Antiquity to the time of the encyclopedia itself.

[10] Sachs (1959) 182 remarks that in the Venetian operas the plots were often so complicated that in the end a solution could only be forced by a *deus ex machina*.

[11] This kind of 'happy ending' is also used in other (Venetian) operas, like Cavalli's *Scipione Africano* (1664): after many misunderstandings: "Ericlea and Luceio are reconciled when she tells him that she knew his real identity. Scipione magnanimously restores Siface to his kingdom and has him reunited with Sofonisba, who was rescued by Masinissa. Scipione demands the execution of Masinissa, but Siface successfully argues for clemency." See Mason (1990). The same pattern in *Zenobia, Regina de' Palmireni* (1694) by Marchi (Mason [1990]). Cf. also below note 19.

Magnanimity is also the subject in a long scene in Theodoros Prodromos's *Rhodanthe and Dosikles*, VII, 320 ff., where Kratandros and Dosikles are on the point of

Chrysorrhoe and in *Phlorios and Platzia Phlore*. The intriguing problem here is, that *Callimachus and Chrysorrhoe* is generally seen as (one of) the first romance(s) in the vernacular and of oriental origin, probably written by Andronicus Palaeologue,[12] member of the imperial family, whereas *Phlorios and Platzia Phlore* is clearly imported from the West. The romance *Callimachus and Chrysorrhoe* is the most fabulous of the preserved romances. There the abduction motif is actually used twice. During the expedition of the three brothers who are sent out by their father in order to determine who of the three is the bravest and the most worthy successor to the throne, the youngest is the only one who dares to force his way into a castle guarded by snakes or dragons. Inside he comes across a girl who is suspended by her hair from the ceiling which imitates the sky with sun, moon and stars. She has been abducted by a monstrous dragon, who terrorized the land of her royal parents (one recognizes the ancient story of Andromeda and the sea-monster), but refusing the dragon as her husband she is hanged from the ceiling whenever the dragon goes out.[13] The girl warns the boy against the dragon and points to a large chest in which he can hide to make himself invisible

being sacrificed to the gods by Bryaxares, who, however, is impressed by the intrepidity of Dosikles facing death. Finally he is convinced by Kratandros that the (real) gods are not satisfied by human sacrifices, expressed in VIII 50-2: Δὸς τοῖς θεοῖς τὸν οἶκτον ἀντὶ θυσίας / καλὴ θεοῖς τράπεζα φιλανθρωπία, / καλὸς κρατὴρ ἄνθρωπος ἐκφυγὼν φόνον, with a reference to Matthew 9:13 and 12:7 "ἔλεος θέλω καὶ οὐ θυσίαν," see Conca (1994) 240-53.

[12] Andronikos Komnenos Branas Doukas Angelos Palaiologos, son of the sebastocrator Constantine and Irene Branas, and nephew of Michael VIII. In Beaton (^{2}1996) 110-11 (the most recent examination of the 'classical' and vernacular Byzantine romances) the authorship of Andronicus is accepted without hesitation. In the sequence of the romances, the *Callimachus* is put in the first or second place (only preceded by the *Achilleïs*, a doubtful theory in my opinion. On stylistic grounds (e.g. the compound words) I consider the *Achilleïs* as one of the later romances). In any case it is dated before *Phlorios ke Platziaphlore*. See on *Callimachus and Chrysorrhoë* also Beck (1971) 117-20; 124-27, on *Phlorios and Platzia Phlore*, Beck (1971) 140-3. See also Aerts (1997a) 702; 703.

[13] In the 'second' Byzantine romance, *Belthandros and Chrysantza*, the beginning of the story strongly resembles the 'intro' of Callimachus: Belthandros, the youngest of two sons, goes out with three friends of the same age, comes along a fiery river to a castle, residence of Eros, where he sees the portrait of a beautiful girl, Chrysantza, to whom, in a dream of a contest of girls organised by Eros who compels him to decide which of them is the most beautiful, he gives the trophy. Fallen in love and trying to find the real Chrysantza, he traces her in Antioch, meets her in the garden of the palace, where he is trapped and, in order to save his life, is forced to marry the servant of Chrysantza. Later he escapes with Chrysantza and returns to his home land, where he becomes king.

(compare Perseus in the Andromeda-myth). The dragon appears, chastises the girl, takes a copious meal, and falls asleep. This offers the boy the big opportunity to kill the dragon. A prosperous honeymoon dawns for Callimachus and Chrysorrhoe, but a rival king catches a glimpse of the girl, falls in love, and hires a sorceress, who prepares a wondrous apple which causes death to the one who holds the apple to his breast, but revives the one under whose nose the apple is held. She pretends a faint, and gives the apple to Callimachus who came to her rescue. He drops dead and Chrysorrhoe is abducted by the rival king. Fortunately Callimachus's brothers are warned by a miraculous ring; they find him and bring him back to life by means of the apple.[14] Callimachus immediately sets out to find his bride. Eventually he finds a person in mourning, who says that everyone in the country is forced by the new queen to wear mourning clothes. The queen herself seems to be unapproachable and inconsolable, while the king waits and sees, hoping for a change in the queen's attitude. This queen might be Chrysorrhoe, thinks Callimachus. He goes to the park of the palace and is engaged by the old gardener, who is not able to perform all the wishes of the new queen. By means of a small ring, which Callimachus has suspended from an orange tree,[15] Chrysorrhoe finds out that the gardener's new boy must be Callimachus. She pretends yet more grief, and demands to be totally alone in her pavilion, even during the night. Only the young gardener can bring her some relief. Of course he can! The queen's spleen seems to melt away, the servants are happy, but also suspicious. They force an old servant to stay in the garden at night in order to see what caused the 'u-turn' in the attitude of the queen. The queen and her boy-friend are caught in the act and betrayed to the king. The king is,

[14] In the 'third' Byzantine romance a similar case takes place: Libistros and Rhodamne are married, but the rival and rejected king Belderichos appears during a hunting party, disguised as a merchant (cf. Barlaam !), and offers for sale a beautiful ring. Libistros puts the ring on his finger and drops dead. Before he is carried to the grave the ring is taken off and he immediately revives. He goes out in search of Rhodamne who was abducted by the rival king. He finds her in Egypt and brings her back home. A magic ring plays also an important (but positive) role in the 'popular' version of *Floire und Blanscheflur*, resp. *Phlorios kai Platzia Phlore*, see Frenzel (^{6}1983) 216-18.

[15] In the allegorical poem of Philes which seems to be composed on the pattern of the Callimachus romance, the ring is placed and found in a bunch of roses (cf. the basket of roses in Phlorios and Platzia Phlore?). On Manuel Philes (±1275-1345) see e.g. Buchwald, Hohlweg, Prinz (^{3}1982) s.v.; Pichard (1956) Introd. xxvi ff.; Beaton (^{2}1996) 190-2.

of course, disappointed and angry, and he summons his court to sentence the lovers to death. With a parable, however, of a mighty man who tries to harvest the fruits of work done by a diligent gardener and with her question to the king, whether such behaviour is honest or not, Chrysorrhoe makes the king realize that he did wrong to both Callimachus and Chrysorrhoe. He lets them go with all honours, and puts the sorceress to death.

A comparable situation is created in *Phlorios and Platzia Phlore,* in the second half of the fourteenth century or early fifteenth century[16] translated and reworked into medieval Greek from a Tuscan *Cantare di Fiorio e Biancifiore,* which itself goes back to a ‘southern’ version of the original Provençal story from the twelfth century. Platzia Phlore, a Christian orphan, has been sold to the Emir of Babylon (probably the Egyptian city Cairo) by the Spanish muslim ruler, who wishes at all costs to prevent her marriage to his son Phlorios. There she is locked in with other beautiful maidens, awaiting marriage to the Emir. The date is imminent. Guided by a number of clues Phlorios arrives in Alexandria and finds his way to Babylon, where his innkeeper informs him about the habits and the weaknesses of the guard of the tower where the girls are kept: he is savage, but also fond of games and money. On the first encounter the guard spares Phlorios’s life, because of his resemblance to Platzia Phlore, and he is prepared to play *távli* (= backgammon) with the intruder. They play three times, three times Phlorios wins and gives back three times not only the high pool but also awakens the greediness of the man with costly gifts. He suggests another gift of an extremely precious cup, if the guard will help him to get into the tower. It is agreed that Phlorios will be smuggled into the tower in a big basket filled with flowers, which the Emir will send to the maidens on the occasion of the month of May, also the wedding day of the Emir’s new bride. Phlorios is nearly discovered by the Emir, but arrives safely in the tower, where he is spotted by a girl-friend of Platzia Phlore. Phlorios and Platzia Phlore have their first wedding night, but oversleep the time that Platzia Phlore should pay her respects to the Emir. The lovers are caught in their bed by the Emir. Brought before the court both of them plead guilty to save the other, but they are both condemned to the stake. The flames, however, are now extinguished

[16] See Beaton (^{2}1996) 137.

through a miraculous ring, which Phlorios had once received from his mother.[17] The public now asks for a new trial. The Emir consents and inquires where Phlorios comes from. On hearing that Phlorios is the son of the Spanish ruler, who happens to be his cousin, he is very pleased and joins the lovers in marriage. After their return to Spain the wedding is celebrated again and Phlorios's parents embrace Christianity.

If we compare these three pieces, we observe that all three of the plots lead to a cul-de-sac. Only the magnanimity of the victor can bring the rescuing solution. We can also state that in the opera of Mozart, elements of both *Phlorios* and *Callimachus* appear. For instance, it is not difficult to compare the person of Osmin with the savage guard in Phlorios. Where the latter can be bribed with money, the first is vulnerable to booze. Constanze's being inconsolable makes her comparable to both Chrysorrhoe and Platzia Phlore; this motif functions at the same level as the arguments and tricks that are used in the ancient romances by girls in brothels in order to preserve their virginity. On the other hand, the opera does not use Phlorios' trick with the basket of flowers, whereas the introduction of the architect in the *Entführung* corresponds with the role of Callimachus who hires himself out as a gardener.[18] The motif, however, of the son who happens to be the son of an old acquaintance of the man in power seems to be taken from the *Phlorios*, with the difference that Phlorios's father is an old friend, but Belmonte's parent a detested foe. With this change the author of the libretto heightened the tension and gave the pasha the role of the noble savage.[19]

[17] Exactly the same happens in Heliodorus's romance, book 8: "Chariklea, des Morden angeklagt, soll verbrannt werden; die Flammen des Scheiterhaufens weichen von ihr zurück, da sie den magischen Ring Pantarbes, welchen die Mutter ihr mitgegeben hatte, an sich trägt." (Rohde [^{5}1974] 458).

[18] It should be remembered that in *Barlaam and Joasaph* the monk Barlaam sees his way to gain an entry to the prince by disguising himself as a merchant who offers a very costly object for sale.

[19] In the contacts between the Western Crusaders and the Muslim rulers of the Middle East great esteem was accorded to the sultan Saladin, who reconquered Jerusalem. In the *Divina Commedia* of Dante he is the only Muslim who did not go to Hell (see Frenzel [^{2}1980] 794: 'Der edele Wilde'). This change is due to either Mozart himself or to Stephanie the Younger. In the text of Bretzner Selim recognises his own son. (See Paumgartner [1957] II, 29). In Heliodorus, book 9, it is the noble Aethiopic king Hydaspes, who frees his enemy Oroondates (see Rohde [^{5}1974] 459; see also Johne [1989] 174 note 1). In Livy 26, 50, and 51 a noble role is given to Cornelius Scipio Africanus Major, who restores a beautiful captivated girl to her fi-

That Bretzner, the creator of the *Entführung* plot, was inspired by the romance of Floris and Blancheflor is not surprising.[20] More surprising is the fact that a number of features strikingly agree with the Callimachus romance. And here emerges a serious problem: can Bretzner have had knowledge of this romance? Currently only one manuscript, Scaligeranus 55, is known, deposited with the University Library of Leiden. From quotations in the second edition from 1614 of his *Glossarium graeco-barbarum* it is clear that Meursius made use of this manuscript. In his *Études sur la littérature grecque moderne* (Paris, 1866) the scholar C. Gidel located this (or another?) manuscript in the Imperial Library of Vienna, but probably wrongly. In his *Medieval Greek texts* (London 1870) Wagner again mentioned Leiden as the location of the manuscript. This situation does not exclude the possibility that Bretzner could have read the Scaliger manuscript. On the other hand his use of another manuscript (now unknown or lost) can not be excluded either. If this is not the case, then there remains only the supposition that Bretzner adapted his plot on the basis of data which became available through the general interest in his time for the oriental world[21] and of his knowledge of the classical romances. However this may be, I leave this question gladly to those who are competent in the field of German literary history or history of music and who are knowledgeable about the persons of Bretzner, Stephanie and Mozart.

If we look to the history of medieval Greek literature, another serious problem emerges: is there a relationship between the *Phlorios* and the *Callimachus*, and if so, what is that relationship? It is generally accepted that *Callimachus and Chrysorrhoe* was written by the Byzantine prince Andronicus Palaeologus. According to Michel Pichard he wrote his poem between 1310 and 1340.[22] Trypanis ([1981] 537) underlines the possibility of the authorship by Andronicus Palaeologus and remarks: "The knowledge of Byzantine court etiquette and the somewhat conservative form of Greek employed, as well as

ancee Allucius, on whom he moreover bestows a generous dowry. See also above in this essay note 11.

[20] See also Paumgartner (1957) II, 26; 27.

[21] See Paumgartner (1957) II, 28.

[22] See Pichard (1956) Introd. p. xxviii; Buchwald, Hohlweg, Prinz (^{3}1982) s.v. 'Kallimachos und Chrysorrhoe'; Cupane (1995) 49. Beck (1971) deals with this romance as the first of the series, but does not enter into the question of date and authorship.

the lack of any pronounced Western influence may well support this view." Beck ([1971] 118-19), simply follows the analysis of Megas, who emphasizes the fairy tale character of the poem, without going into the specific *Entführung* motif at its end. Pichard does not make any remark on the character of the piece nor any comparison with other romances. Finally, Caroline Cupane sees in this romance two axes at work, one axis: love at first sight – separation – reunion, which is interpreted as 'classical' Greek, the other: adventure – love story – loss of the beloved – reconquest which is interpreted as a Western feature of story telling. Except perhaps for the motif of the three rival boys, who set out to establish the 'pecking order,' I do not see an essential difference between the two axes or a relevant difference in respect to the 'classical' romances. But neither has Cupane observed the *Entführung* motif. If anything could have influenced this aspect of the plot, then it is the *Phlorios* romance. That would require that this romance was introduced earlier into the Byzantine world than Andronicus composed his story. Here, however, we meet with dating problems. According to Trypanis this romance was translated at the end of the fourteenth or the beginning of the fifteenth century. Beck suggests an earlier date, but even so it can hardly be earlier than the Callimachus romance, for the model of the translation was almost certainly *il Cantare di Fiorio e Bianciafiore*, which is to be dated in the first half of the fourteenth century. Beaton generally maintains the 'traditional' datings, which implies an earlier date of Callimachus than of Phlorios, and considers the Callimachus romance as the only one not influenced from the West.[23]

Another problem is of a geographical sort. Giuseppe Spadaro, whose study of the Byzantine romances in general deserves high praise, has put forward the theory that the *Phlorios* theme entered the Greek world through the Frankish community at the time of the visit of Andrea Acciaiuolo, friend of Boccaccio, to the Peloponnese (1338-1341).[24] The Acciaiuolo family, and especially Nicoló (*1310-†1365),[25] acquired important interests in the Peloponnese and in the mainland of Greece in the period 1330-1360, and the Greek version of *Phlorios* may very well have originated in this Italian-Greek con-

[23] Beaton (^{2}1996) 219: "Undoubtedly Western traces are discernible in all but *Kallimachos*."
[24] See Beck (1971) 142.
[25] On the Acciaiuolo family, see Hopf (1873) 476; Lock (1995) 130-1.

text. Time of origin is probably the second half of the fourteenth century, in any case earlier than the romance *Imberios and Margaronne*, of which the Greek version is dated in the first half of the fifteenth century.[26] Yet apart from the date, one may ask whether the political controverses between the Byzantines, trying to re-establish their power in Greece, and the Western intruders, trying to defend their conquests, were a convenient climate for literary import or export. Beck, indeed, observes as to the *Phlorios*: “…whether the poem therefore has ever become Byzantine property in the real sense of this word, remains questionable” (Beck [1971] 143).

If one, nevertheless, seeks a scenario for the borrowing of the *Entführung* motif in *Callimachus* from *Phlorios*, a fully different approach is necessary and could be the following: an important group of barons from the Morea, among them the prince of the Morea himself, were prisoners in Constantinople for three years (1259-1262); they were later replaced by Frankish hostages. Though the atmosphere breathed enmity, there were also contacts based on mutual respect, and perhaps some cultural exchange took place.[27] If this was indeed the case, and if indeed the story of Phlorios and Platziaphlore was ‘on the program,’ then the plot was brought directly to Nicaea, or else to Constantinople, though being told on the basis of the original Provençal text. It sounds improbable, but even improbabilities happen in (literary) history.

If this ‘construction’ is rejected (proof cannot be produced), the conclusion has to be that the *Entführung* motif in *Callimachus and Chrysorrhoe* can hardly be taken from the *Phlorios* romance, neither on grounds of time nor of place. As to the original *Floire et Blanchefleur*, its oriental character is often emphasized. And this gives rise to the supposition that the *Entführung* theme, according to my interpre-

---

[26] The dependence of the Imberios romance on *Phlorios and Platzia Phlore* is made plausible by Spadaro (1975).

[27] The cultural climate at the Frankish court under Guillaume de Villehardouin, who himself is known as a singer, was of a high standard, see Lock (1995) 102 and notes 66 and 67.

tation, has independently been taken from oriental story telling by the poets of both *Callimachus and Chrysorrhoe* and *Floire et Blanchefleur*.[28]

[28] I thank Mr. Dale Carr who was so kind (again!) to correct my English text.

STAGING THE FRINGE BEFORE SHAKESPEARE: HANS SACHS AND THE ANCIENT NOVEL

Niklas Holzberg

It is well known that the plot of the *Historia Apollonii regis Tyri*, or more precisely a later version of this, was adapted for the stage by Shakespeare in the form of a comedy: *Pericles, Prince of Tyre,* written between 1606 and 1608. A few years previously in another of his comedies, *Troilus and Cressida,* he had also availed himself of certain motifs derived ultimately from two ancient texts which, like the *Historia,* are classed as fringe novels: the Troy stories of Ps.-Dares and Ps.-Dictys. But Shakespeare was not the first to dramatise ancient novels. A good fifty years earlier the Nürnberg cobbler and *Meistersinger* Hans Sachs (1494-1576) had turned the plots of three ancient prose narratives into his own brand of drama: a tragedy on the fall of Troy dating from 28th April 1554,[1] a tragedy on the life of Alexander the Great (27th September 1558),[2] and a comedy on Aesop (23rd November 1560).[3] Sachs read the three fringe novels used – Ps.-Dictys' *Troy Story*, Ps.-Callisthenes' *Alexander Romance,* and the anonymous *Aesop Romance* – in the German translations by, respectively, Marcus Tatius Alpinus,[4] Johannes Hartlieb,[5] and Heinrich Steinhöwel.[6]

The incarnation of Hans Sachs created by Richard Wagner in his opera *Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg* is famous the world over, but even amongst students and teachers of German literature the historical Sachs is no more than a name to all except the specialists. The latter, of course, know him not only as *Meistersinger*, but also as

---

[1] *Tragedia mit 13 personen, die zerstörung der statt Troya von den Griechen, unnd hat 6 actus,* in Keller and Goetze (1964) vol. 12, 279-316.

[2] *Tragedia mit 21 personen: Von Alexander Magno, dem könig Macedonie, sein geburt, leben und endt, unnd hat 7 actus,* in Keller and Goetze (1964) vol. 13, 477-529.

[3] *Eine comedi mit acht personen: Esopus, der fabeldichter, und hat fünff actus,* in Keller and Goetze (1964) vol. 20, 113-39, and in Goetze (1880-7) vol. 7, 142-67.

[4] *Warhafftige Histori vnd beschreibung von dem Troianischen krieg…* (Augsburg: Heinrich Steiner, 26. Juni 1536); see Fochler (1990) 16ff.

[5] *Histori Eusebij von dem grossen künig Alexander,* first printed Augsburg (Johann Bämler), 1472; see Pawis (1991).

[6] *Esopus* (Ulm: Johann Zainer, ca. 1476/77); see Dicke (1994).

dramatist.[7] *Meisterlieder* and stage plays are two of the various genres cultivated by Germany’s sedentary minstrel-craftsmen. These poetry-writing members of the urban lower-middle classes were particularly active in the 16th and 17th centuries. They joined together to form guilds which can be seen as forerunners of later literary circles: the *Meistersinger* societies, founded in, apart from Nürnberg, numerous towns all over Central and Southern Germany and Austria. On closer inspection, the literary output of individual members shows clearly that one of the aims was to provide for others of their class texts in plain, rhyming German as vehicles for religious and secular learning. Ways of improving the mind were not always easily accessible at the time: books were very expensive, not everyone could read, and those that could had in any case little time to do so simply because of their long working hours. Oral presentation of literature in the form of songs and plays was, for the audiences targeted by Hans Sachs and his fellow guildsmen, a much more convenient and digestible alternative. One further aim of the *Meistersinger* was the moral instruction of their audiences and readers.

The dramas of Hans Sachs were first staged by himself and other craftsmen in Nürnberg, and later performed in other cities all over Germany. Since every play had to be ‘vetted’ by the Nürnberg City Council before it could be performed, and since the minutes of all such proceedings have survived, our knowledge of the city’s theatrical life is relatively good. The documents mention, for example, details of which plays were presented to the censors for approval, and of when staging was permitted – as a rule from Candlemas until the first Sunday in Lent (the carnival season) and then only on Sundays and Mondays; they also tell us which buildings the Council made available for performances, and about those cases in which the Council exercised censorship. The three dramas I shall be discussing below were most probably first performed in one of the Nürnberg churches which, with the arrival of Martin Luther’s Reformation in 1525, were for a time no longer used for religious services. The actual stage would be set up by the *Meistersinger* in the chancel. These churches were also used as venues for the *Meisterlied* sessions, in which songs would be rendered under the watchful eyes (or ears) of *Merker*, these being, as it were, guild-appointed sticklers for the

[7] Still the best introduction for the following: Brunner (1976).

rules: the prescribed melody and stanza form, i.e. the *Ton* of each *Lied* had to be adhered to entirely without instrumental accompaniment.

The intention of these craftsmen authors being to educate and edify their audiences, their dramas were accordingly created as didactic vehicles. In all of his tragedies and comedies[8]—he wrote a total of 127—Sachs has a herald appear before the start of the action and deliver a long speech to the spectators, a prologue, in which he tells them about the background and plot of the play, thus effectively removing any suspense as to its ending. Sachs then dramatises his source—usually, as in the three cases to be considered here, a narrative text—in several acts (mostly five). In the course of these he switches from setting to setting—even within individual scenes—with not a care for unity, and thus unfolds a sort of pictorial broadsheet with no visible threads of suspense or dramatic complications. The virtual absence of theatrical effects in this form of presentation facilitates the steering of the audience's attention towards the moral lesson to be learnt from the story. By adapting selectively the material in his source and structuring it with a view to his own desired effect, the author already imparts implicitly the message, and then he brings back the herald to spell it out in an epilogue. His selection and arrangement of the given material is also designed to convey the contents in a simple, understandable form. The finished result is, therefore, not so much a true theatre play, as an abbreviated version of a narrative, converted into monologues and dialogues and extended to include a moralising commentary: an audio-visual happening that will save the audience the trouble or expense of reading, and that will furthermore prompt a particular interpretation. From a modern point of view this may seem rather crude, and it is a literary form that was not destined to survive long after its hey-day. On the other hand, modern adaptations of narrative literature in slap-dash television production are really not so very different.

In the 16th century, at any rate, there was definitely a demand amongst Germany's middle- and lower-class urban population for the type of literary transformation undertaken by Hans Sachs. Let us see, then, how he managed to adapt the three fringe novels for this audi-

[8] On the plays of Hans Sachs see esp. Holzberg (1976); Krause (1979); Michael (1984); Klein (1988); Holzberg (1992b); Holzberg (1995b); Stuplich (1998).

ence. In his tragedy on the fall of Troy[9] he confined himself to the chain of events triggered by Achilles' love for Polyxena, arranging these simply and clearly in six acts. In Act 1 Achilles tries to win Polyxena's hand for a marriage that would end the war, but is thwarted by Hector; Acts 2 and 3 show the immediate results of the continuing hostilities – Patroclus, who had done the wooing for Achilles, is killed by Hector (Act 2), who is in turn killed by Achilles (Act 3); in Act 4 the love-lorn hero pines while Hecuba plans an attempt on his life; in Act 5 the attempt succeeds, and in Act 6 Troy is conquered and Polyxena killed by Achilles' son Neoptolemus. All is strictly geared to the conveyance of the two morals later to be stated explicitly in the epilogue. The audience is shown no more and no less than an exemplary illustration of what it is expected to learn: that firstly war, and secondly blind passion are Bad Things. The herald's final speech then drives this home in typical sledge-hammer style: *From this tragic tale should arise / For us these days two words to the wise.*[10] Although all the *dramatis personae* are drawn primarily to prove by their actions the truth of these two lessons, some of them do, however, appear not simply as functional classic examples, but as real characters. This can be said of, above all, Polyxena: like the heroines in the novels of Chariton, Achilles Tatius, and Heliodorus, she has been given a dominating role in this scenically adapted 'novel'. Sachs has her appear in all but one of the acts in impressive scenes, and what she has to say underlines conspicuously the two morals of the piece. Within the limits dictated by the didactic intentions involved, Hans Sachs managed to create a drama that has a certain appeal. There is some evidence to suggest that it was still being staged in the mid-17th century, more precisely, on 16th February 1653 in St. Gallen, Switzerland.[11]

As in the case of Polyxena, Hans Sachs gave his Alexander real profile.[12] The drama, which tells in seven acts the story of the hero's life, has at first glance all the appearances of a mechanical compilation of material from the four sources used: the *Alexander Romance*, Plutarch's biography, and the relevant passages in Justinus' *Historiae*

---

[9] See the detailed discussion in Fochler (1990) 121-9; cf. also Abele (1897-9) 12f.

[10] Keller and Goetze (1964) vol. 12, 314.38-315.1: *Auß der tragedi hab wir sehr Zu warnung zwo getrewer lehr.*

[11] Fochler (1990) 129.

[12] See the detailed discussion in: Stuplich (1998) 287-99; cf. also Abele (1897-9) 34-6.

Philippicae and Boccaccio's *De casibus virorum illustrium*. True, episode follows episode and act act in an unrelieved succession of events, all unfolded like snapshots in a wallet. And the first two acts, which are based on Johannes Hartlieb's version of Ps.-Callisthenes, and which relate Nectanebus' deception, his murder at the hands of Alexander, and Philip's murder at the instigation of his wife Olympias, do appear disjointed, not being organically linked to the rest of the play; they do not need to be read in order to understand the other five acts. Again, however, Sachs is not interested in any skilful, dramatically effective arrangement of the plot, but concentrates on the exemplification of his intended moral, one which is closely linked to the figure of Alexander. His portrayal of the king is primarily a negative one, that of a general who places all his faith blindly in what he perceives as destiny, and whose actions are accordingly irresponsible. In the epilogue the herald then warns that no good can come of being the very kind of ruler Alexander represents:

By this tale note that potentates
Who thirst after others' royal estates,
In contradiction to honour and right
For no good reason war and fight
Only for their rule to extend,
Often come to a sticky end ...
Dire will the judgement be
Pronounced by God to him only,
With eternal curses and damnation.
Pray God good Christians shun such temptation,
And that will flourish constant pax
Amongst kings is the wish of Hans Sachs.[13]

He may actually only appear as king in Acts 3-7, and can therefore only then be seen as an undesirable kind of ruler, but Acts 1 and 2 at least prepare the way for the following negative characterisation of Alexander in so far as he is introduced there as the illegitimate son of a sorcerer, and as parricide with a husband-killing mother: his origins and first deed are in line with his later development. These early

[13] Keller/Goetze (1964) vol. 13, 527.3-8 and 528.13-18: *Bey der histori merck ein fürst, Welchen nach frembder herrschafft thürst Wider ehr, recht und billigkeit, Ahn noht und ursach kriegt und streidt, Allein sein herrschafft zu erweitern, Darunter doch offt geht zu scheitern (...) Wie schwer wirt im das urteil sein, Das im der richter spricht allein, Der in verdambt mit ewig fluch! Gott helff, das in kein christ versuch Und das ein steter friedt auff-wachs Bey allen fürsten, wünscht H. Sachs.*

scenes—the first dramatisation of a lengthy passage from the *Alexander Romance* (1.1-24)—cannot, therefore, be dismissed as unnecessary and irrelevant preamble. This tragedy too deserves recognition at least as an example of good cautionary drama.

From the *Aesop Romance* Sachs took the following episodes for his comedy about the slave and his lip: the two occasions on which Aesop changes owner and proves to both masters—the merchant and Xanthus—that he knows all the answers form Acts 1 and 2. The remaining three acts are devoted entirely to Aesop's misogynous actions and words. Act 3 shows him insulting Xanthus' wife at their very first meeting, in Act 4 he characteristically takes the orders of his master all too literally, thus insulting the wife again and causing her to leave her husband and go back to live with her father; in Act 5 Aesop cunningly brings her back to her husband. Here too Sachs' treatment of the central *personae* creates an impression of thematic unity. The *Vita Aesopi* has in recent years come to be seen as a forerunner of the picaresque novel,[14] a genre also closely related to Hermann Bote's *Till Eulenspiegel* of 1510/11. Sachs, who adapted and versified several episodes from Bote's text, was undoubtedly aware of the similarities between Eulenspiegel and Aesop. This could explain why in his dramatisation of Steinhöwel's German translation of the *Aesop Romance* he gave the element of burlesque more prominence than it has in his source. This he achieved by prolonging the comic scenes and using particularly ribald language. There is a not too serious didactic intention: a plea on behalf of hen-pecked husbands for more gentleness on the part of the wives. The Xanthippes of yore may be dead, he says, but:

They have for us left behind
Women of their daughters' and own kind
With whom we keep house nowadays,
Who have their ancestresses' very same ways.
For this thing then now all men yearn,
That wives like that sweet temper learn.
That flourish peace, tranquillity
'Tween spouses is Hans Sachs' plea.[15]

[14] See most recently Papademetriou (1997) 58-72.
[15] Keller and Goetze (1964) vol. 20, 139.16-23: *Doch habens uns glassen da hinden Weiber von iren töchtern und kinden, Mit den wir ietzund halten hauß, Sind fast ir mütter art durchauß. Deß ist aller männer begern, Daß sie ein wenig gschlächter*

The message is, however, in this case eclipsed by the author's obvious enjoyment of sitcom. Once again, Hans Sachs displays a certain skill in adapting a source from the realm of the ancient fringe novel to the literary needs of his contemporaries, and in this respect turning it into something original.

There is one text—we touched on it at the beginning of this paper—which is not counted by classical scholars as an ancient novel in the stricter sense, but which was in early modern times just as popular as the Troy Stories and the Alexander and Aesop Romances, and which, strangely enough, Hans Sachs did not dramatise: the *Historia Apollonii regis Tyri*, the ancient narrative adapted by Shakespeare. Sachs knew this text in the German translation created by Heinrich Steinhöwel,[16] but it inspired him only to one single *Meisterlied*, written on 14th January 1553. This covers the adventures of Apollonius up until his marriage to King Archestrates' daughter, and the moral of these is that anyone oppressed by the fickleness of fate ought not to lose heart.[17] This text would merit inclusion here as a final consideration of Sachs' use of ancient narratives, but he also wrote one other *Meisterlied* based in content on an ancient novel proper. It was written on 8th October 1538 and set to a *Ton* Sachs had composed himself—the *Spruchweise*.[18] In content it is a précis of Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*—Sachs read this in Johannes Sieder's translation[19]—with the main focus on the scene where Lucius is turned into an ass. The entire third stanza is devoted to the lesson to be drawn from Apuleius' 'fable': comparable to the ass are those whose extramarital affairs turn their heads completely and cause them much suffering, until the consumption of the roses of just punishment and enlightenment finally restores their sense. And the delinquent immune to such flower power? Well, as Sachs says: *he'll remain with many a knave / for ever an ass unto the grave*.[20] The tale and its moral are brought by Sachs into particularly successful and effective harmony

wern, Dadurch gut frid und rhu auffwachß Im ehling stand. Das wünscht Hans Sachs.

[16] *Histori des Künigs Appolonij* (Augsburg: G. Zainer, 1471).

[17] See Abele (1897-9) 61; Brunner and Wachinger (1986-7) vol. 11, 189 (lists manuscripts and editions).

[18] See Abele (1897-9) 74; Brunner and Wachinger (1986-7) vol. 9, 300-1.

[19] *Ain Schön Lieblich / auch kurtzweylig gedichte Lucij Apuleij von ainem gulden Esel*... (Augsburg: Alexander Weißenhorn, 1538).

[20] *Der pleib mit andern pueben Ein esel pis int grueben* (text taken from the autograph in the Sächsische Landesbibliothek Dresden, M 12, 56^{v}-57^{v}).

here, and the famous *Meistersinger* coloratura—familiar, of course, from Wagner—is cleverly employed to underscore vividly the distress of the ass and of foolish lovers. The text need not shy comparison with any of the other interpretations that have been advanced from the Middle Ages until the present day.

HELIODOR, MADEMOISELLE DE SCUDÉRY UND UMBERTO ECO: LEKTÜREN DES LIEBESROMANS IN *L'ISOLA DEL GIORNO PRIMA*

Günter Berger

Vom Vater der Romane

Umberto Ecos jüngster Roman ist bekanntlich in der Epoche des Barock angesiedelt, und seine Handlung spielt nicht zuletzt im Paris des Kardinals Richelieu. Dort lief zu dieser Zeit ein zuerst von Guez de Balzac kolportiertes Bonmot des Bischofs von Aire-sur-Adour, Sébastien Bouthillier um, wonach Heliodor als Vater der Romane zu gelten habe. Denn diese seien in ihrer Mehrzahl nichts anderes als Heliodore in neuen Gewändern, nichts als Kinder, erzeugt in der ehelichen Verbindung von Theagenes und Charikleia, Nachkommen, die ihren Eltern bis aufs Haar ähnelten.[1] Im Jahre 1664 wird Charles Sorel das Bonmot wiederum aufgreifen und unter der Rubrik *Des Romans Heroïques* seiner *Bibliotheque françoise* diese Nachkommenschaft gattungsgeschichtlich präziser verorten.[2] Und genau an diesem Ort siedelt er neben vielen anderen auch Mademoiselle de Scudérys Roman *Clélie* (1654-1660) an und stellt als dessen berühmtesten Part die *Carte de Tendre* heraus. Diese lasse erkennen, so fährt er fort, wie man in der Form einer '*honneste Amitié*' lieben könne, ohne sich zu den Verirrungen einer rasenden Liebesleiden-

---

[1] Vgl. die der *Histoire indienne* (1629) von Boisrobert vorausgehende *Lettre de Monsieur de Balzac escrite à une Dame de qualité*, zit. nach Coulet (1968), Bd. II, 39 : '*Aussi ne sont-ce la pluspart que des Heliodores déguisez, ou comme disoit feu Monsieur l'Evesque d'Ayre, des enfans qui sont venus du mariage de Theagene et de Cariclée, et qui ressemblent si fort à leur pere et à leur mere, qu'il n'y a pas un cheveu de difference.*'

[2] Vgl. Sorel (1970) 182 : '*[...] on a eu bonne grace de dire que du mariage de ces deux Amans, sont nez Clitophon & Leucippe, Theagene & Chariclee, Ismen & Ismenie & tous les autres Heros & Heroïnes des Romans suivans, que les Grecs nous ont laissez.*' Daß diese Vorstellungen von der chronologischen Abfolge der griechischen Romane keine Gültigkeit mehr beanspruchen können, versteht sich von selbst. Heutzutage gelten die *Aithiopika* eher als späte Vollendung des antiken Liebesromans und werden überwiegend dem 4. nachchristlichen Jahrhundert zugerechnet (siehe Morgan [1996a] 417-21).

schaft hinreißen zu lassen.[3] Eine ganz ähnliche Auffassung vom Modellcharakter der *Aithiopika* für den französischen heroisch-galanten Roman ihrer Zeit entwickeln im übrigen auch Madeleine de Scudéry selbst—bzw. ihr Bruder Georges—in der Vorrede zum Roman *Ibrahim* (1641)[4] und insbesondere der Bischof Pierre-Daniel Huet in seinem höchst einflußreichen Traktat über den Roman von 1670.[5] Den Titel eben dieses Traktats nutzt Eco für das 28. Kapitel seines Romans, das er *Dell'Origine dei Romanzi* tauft, wie er schon das 13. mit *La Carta del Tenero* überschrieben hatte. Dieses intertextuelle Verfahren der Kapitelüberschrift als Zitat eines Werktitels zeigen im übrigen so gut wie alle vierzig Kapitel der *Isola del giorno prima*. Doch wenden wir uns nun diesem 13., dem Kapitel der Zärtlichkeit zu!

Vom sinnlichen Umgang mit neuplatonischer Liebestopographie

Dieses Kapitel liefert uns ein typisches Beispiel für Ecos umdeutende Aneignung von Deutungsmustern und literarischen Formen der Vergangenheit, hier des Barock. Zunächst ein kurzer Blick auf die Ebene der Erzählhandlung: Der Protagonist Roberto de la Grive liegt allein und verlassen auf der nahe einer Insel mitten im Pazifik gestrandeten Fleute namens *Daphne* und erinnert sich an seine erste Liebe, ein eher robust-sinnenfreudiges Bauernmädchen, in das er sich während der Belagerung von Casale unsterblich verliebt hatte. Seinen in der Kunst galanter Liebesbillets erfahrenen väterlichen Freund Saint-Savin läßt er metaphernreich gedrechselte Liebesbriefe verfassen, als gälten sie einer fernen Pariser Salondame und nicht einem 'Casa-

[3] Sorel (1970) 185.

[4] Im Vorwort zu *Ibrahim ou l'illustre Bassa* (1641) wird im Rahmen des Bekenntnisses zur Nachahmung der *'fameux Romans de l'Antiquité'* namentlich allein Heliodor erwähnt, zit. nach Berger (1996) 80. Zur Rezeption des griechischen Romans in der französischen Romanpraxis des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts vgl. zuletzt Sandy (1996).

[5] Der sonst so kritisch-gelehrte Huet greift, um den Vorbildcharakter der keuschen Liebe zwischen Theagenes und Charikleia für die Romane seiner französischen Landsleute d'Urfé und Scudéry gehörig herauszustellen, auf die alte, u.a. von Photios verbreitete Legende zurück, wonach der Autor der *Aithiopika* Bischof von Trikka gewesen sei, wenngleich er, da selbst Bischof, dem problematischen Gipfelpunkt der Legende mit der Abdankung Heliodors vom Hirtenamt statt Verbrennung seines geliebten Werkes, keinen Glauben zu schenken vermag; vgl. 'Lettre de l'origine des romans' in: Berger (1996) 151.

lische(n) Hürchen' (124).[6] In ganz lebhafter Erinnerung ist ihm auch, daß er sich, vom Fieber geschüttelt, im pestverseuchten Casale zu einem weiteren väterlichen Freund, dem Pater Emanuele, rettet, hinter dem sich kein anderer als der barocke Metapherntheoretiker Emanuele Tesauro, der Verfasser des *Cannocchiale aristotelico* (1654), verbirgt. Angesichts solch metaphernmäßiger Vorbelastung verwundert es nicht, daß Roberto im Fiebertraum sich selbst anstelle des Bauernmädchens liebkost, dessen Spuren er während der Belagerung von Casale verloren hatte. Quasi als Kompensation für diesen Verlust hatte er schon damals in Casale sich eine Art *Carte de Tendre* zurechtgelegt:

> So hatte er sich ein Casale seiner Leidenschaft gezeichnet, hatte Gassen, Brunnen, Plätze in den Fluß der Neigung, den See der Gleichgültigkeit oder das Meer der Feindschaft verwandelt; und hatte aus der verletzten Stadt das Land seiner Ungestillten Sehnsucht gemacht, die Insel (schon damals, ahnungsvoll) seiner Einsamkeit. (131)[7]

Gelebte Erfahrung hatte sich so im kreativen Fiebertraum in Passionen auf(s) Papier verwandelt. Um wieviel stärker muß nun in seiner Verlassenheit auf der *Daphne* die schöpferische Phantasie der Erinnerung auf Roberto wirken! In Fortsetzung seiner Suche auf die Jahre zuvor in Casale Entschwundene macht er sich nun auf dem Schiff auf die Suche nach ihr, seiner sinnlichen Liebe, bzw. seiner Signora, seiner platonisch verehrten Lilia, einer Salondame, die er Jahre später in Paris kennengelernt hatte. Die Verwechslung oder besser: Verschmelzung der beiden Geliebten gelingt umso leichter, als, wie wir gesehen haben, Saint-Savin für ihn Liebesbriefe verfaßt hatte, als wären sie an eine Salondame und nicht an ein Bauernmädchen gerichtet.

Auf dieser Suche nach der nunmehr in die unendlichen Weiten des Südmeeres versetzten Geliebten findet er an Bord des Schiffes eine Seekarte mit den zeitüblichen vagen Umrissen und Küstenlinien einer Insel jener *Terrae incognitae*,

---

[6] Ich zitiere die—hervorragende—Übersetzung Burkhart Kroebers nach folgender Ausgabe: Eco (1995); das Original nach der Ausgabe: Eco (1994).

[7] Vgl. Eco (1994) 118: '*Aveva così disegnato una Casale della propria passione, trasformando viuzze, fontane, spiazzi nel Fiume dell'Inclinazione, nel Lago dell'Indifferenza o nel Mare dell'Inimicizia; aveva fatto della città ferita il Paese della propria Tenerezza insaziata, isola (già allora, presago) della sua solitudine.*'

Terres Inconnues
fol. 399
LA MER DANGEREVSE
Reconnaissance F.
Estime F.
Tendre sur R.
Tendre sur E.
Constante amitie
Bonte
Obeissance
Tendresse
Tendre sur In.
Respect
Exactitude
LAC DINDIFERENCE
MER DINIMITIE
Sensibilite
Generosite
Grands Services
Inclination Fleuve
Probite
Empressement
Grand Cœur
Assiduite
Sincerite
Oubli
Meschancete
Petits Soins
Billet doux
Legerete
Medisance
Soumission
Billet galant
Tiedeur
Perfidie
Complaisance
Iolis Vers
Inesgalite
Indiscretion
Grand effort
Negligence
Orgueil
Nouuelle amitie
2 4 6 8 10
Lieues d'amitie

die er umgehend als seine Insel und die Insel mit ihren Buchten und Bergen als seine Geliebte umdeutet: eine metaphorische Umdeutung, die sich seiner Lehre bei Saint-Savin und Pater Emanuele verdankt. Wollüstig treibt er sein Liebesspiel mit der Karte, macht aber erst dann Ernst, will sagen: ergreift erst dann sexuell von ihr Besitz, als er diesen Besitz von Rivalen bedroht sieht. Soweit also Robertos Umgang mit der zur *Carte de Tendre* und dann zur Geliebten gemachten Seekarte.

Bevor wir auf Ecos Umdeutung zu sprechen kommen, sei zunächst die historische *Carte de Tendre* der Mademoiselle de Scudéry kurz vorgestellt (siehe Abbildung).[8] Hervorgegangen aus dem Salonleben, das heißt Diskussionen um Formen der Liebe und des geselligen Umgangs zwischen ihr und einem Vertrauten, Paul Pellisson, während eines ihrer ‘Samedis’ im November des Jahres 1653,[9] wurde diese Karte im Jahr darauf in den ersten Band der fiktionalen Welt der *Clélie* integriert.[10] Mit anderen Worten: Leben verwandelt sich allegorisch in eine topographische Karte, um dann in den Wäldern der Fiktionen zu entschwinden.[11] Die Protagonistin des Romans, Clélie, aus deren Feder auch die Karte stammt, fungiert in Form einer Reiseführerin zugleich als Interpretin der *Carte de Tendre*: Ziel der Karte ist es laut Clélie zu erläutern, wie ein Verehrer ‘*pouvoit aller de Nouvelle Amitié à Tendre*’ (396). Am Ende ihrer Routenanleitung weist sie warnend darauf hin, es gebe jenseits der ‘tendresse’ ein ganz gefährliches Meer und noch weiter jenseits dieses Meeres unbekannte Landstriche, ‘*Terres inconnuës*’ (405), unbekannt jedenfalls jenen Frauen, welche die Grenzen der ‘*amitié*’ nicht überschreiten. Etwas anders sieht einer von Clélies Verehrern, der ungestüme Horace, die Angelegenheit: Er äußert ihr gegenüber die Befürchtung, bei ihr deswegen nicht auf jenen ominösen unbekannten Landstrichen landen zu können, weil ihnen ein Rivale schon allzu nahe sei, worauf sie pikiert antwortet, daß jener Unbekannte, von dem er spreche, keinesfalls jene unbekannten Landstriche erreicht habe, da dort niemand sei und niemals jemand dorthin gelange (413).

---

[8] Bei dieser Abbildung handelt es sich um ein Exemplar der Württembergischen Landesbibliothek Stuttgart.

[9] Vgl. Munro (1986) 21.

[10] Vgl. de Scudéry (1973) Bd. I, 399. Insofern repräsentiert die Karte laut Munro (1986) 18 ‘*the continuing dialectic between literature and life*’ im 17. Jahrhundert.

[11] Anspielung auf: Eco (1994a). Deutsche Übersetzung durch Kroeber (1996).

Wenn wir nun von der *Clélie* zur *Insel des vorigen Tages* zurückkehren, dann sehen wir, daß Roberto genau dort ansetzt und weitermacht, indem er seiner sexuellen Begierde freien Lauf läßt, sie an der Karte abreagiert, wo Clélie der Leidenschaft des Horace definitiven Einhalt gebietet. Bei Madeleine de Scudéry fungiert die '*tendresse*' als Kontrollinstrument über die 'Gewalt der Leidenschaften'.[12] Liebe wird derart nur möglich im Verzicht auf die Leidenschaften, wie auch schon d'Urfé in der *Astrée* die Liebe ihrer sinnlichen Triebe entkleidet hatte.[13] Andererseits betont d'Urfé mit Ficino die 'Universalität der Liebe' als einer 'Kraft, die das Sein der Welt zusammenhält', eine Universalität, die von Ähnlichkeitsbeziehungen zwischen allen Phänomenen des Universums, von der niedersten Materie bis hin zum Schöpfergott, ausgeht.[14] Von solchen Ähnlichkeitsbeziehungen geht auch noch Roberto in Ecos Roman aus, liest er doch die zugleich nahe und unerreichbare Insel als 'Anagramm eines anderen Körpers' (73), betrachtet die gestrandete *Daphne*, die er bis in den letzten Winkel auf der Jagd nach einem 'Eindringling' durchstöbert, 'wie ein Liebesobjekt':

> Er litt sowohl wegen der Insel, die er nicht hatte, als auch wegen des Schiffes, das ihn hatte: Beide waren für ihn unerreichbar, die Insel w egen ihrer Entfernung, das Schiff wegen seines Rätsels, aber beide standen für eine Geliebte, die ihm auswich, indem sie ihn mit Versprechungen umschmeichelte, die er allein sich gab. (74)[15]

An anderer Stelle bestimmt er die Insel als 'Unerreichbare Nähe', um damit die 'Unähnliche Ähnlichkeit zwischen der Insel und der Signora' (106) zu beschreiben. Obwohl er weiß, daß nur der 'Verzicht auf den Stolz des Besitzens' ein 'Ausdruck vollkommenster Liebe' (110) ist, treibt ihn schließlich die Eifersucht in den Bauch der *Daphne*, um den vermeintlichen Rivalen aufzustöbern, wo er stattdessen die Seekarte findet, um sich mit diesem fast entmaterialisierten Leib zu vereinen. Doch über die Ähnlichkeitsbeziehungen wird die Karte des Südmeers zur Weltkarte und schließlich dreidimensional zur Erdkugel als Makrokosmos, mit der Roberto als

[12] Penzkofer (1998) 203.
[13] Penzkofer (1998) 174.
[14] Penzkofer (1998) 174.
[15] *'Soffriva sia per l'Isola che non aveva, che per la sua distanza, l'altra per il suo enigma – ma entrambe stavano in luogo di una amata che lo eludeva blandendolo di promesse che egli si faceva da solo.'* (65)

Mikrokosmos in eins verschmilzt: Ficino läßt grüßen! Dagegen scheitern alle Versuche Robertos, die Insel zu erreichen oder sich mit seiner angebeteten Signora zu vereinen, wenngleich das Ende letztlich offen bleibt. Wenigstens findet er genau in der Mitte des Romans den langgesuchten vermeintlichen Rivalen, den Eindringling auf der *Daphne*, der sich freilich als Jesuitenpater namens Caspar Wanderdrossel entpuppt.

Damit wären wir endlich bei Ecos Umgang mit den *Aithiopika* Heliodors angelangt. Denn mit dieser Begegnung endet zugleich die nachgeholte Vorgeschichte Robertos, und der Roman beschränkt sich von nun an im wesentlichen auf die Gegenwartshandlung, mit der er, ganz in der Manier der *Aithiopika, in medias res* einsetzt.

Von Heliodor und seinem Nachkommen Eco

Doch der berühmte *in-medias-res*-Beginn der *Aithiopika* wird aus der Perspektive der unwissenden Räuberbande in "eine(r) bewußte(n) Strategie mystifizierender Verrätselung" (Effe)[16] erzählt, während bei Eco von Anfang an ein auktorial-allwissender Erzähler dem Protagonisten ins Wort fällt,[17] ein Zitat aus dessen Aufzeichnungen aus sichtlicher Distanz jahrhundertelanger Literarhistorie ironisch kommentierend:

> Und doch erfüllt mich meine Demütigung mit Stolz, und da zu solchem Privilegio verdammt, erfreue ich mich nun gleichsam einer verabscheuten Rettung: Ich glaube, ich bin seit Menschengedenken das einzige Wesen unsrer Gattung, das schiffbrüchig ward geworfen auf ein verlassenes Schiff.

So, in unverbesserlichem Manierismus, Roberto de La Grive, vermutlich im Juli oder August 1643.[18]

---

[16] Effe (1997) 84.

[17] Dagegen verweigert Heliodors Erzähler seinen Lesern systematisch Informationen über Namen, Herkunft und Schicksal des schönen Paares am Meeresstrand, vgl. Morgan (1999) 267-9. Zur Rätselstruktur des Werkes insgesamt Morgan (1994b).

[18] '"*Eppure m'inorgoglisco della mia umiliazione, e poiché a tal privilegio son condannato, quasi godo di un'aborrita salvezza: sono, credo, a memoria d'uomo, l'unico essere della nostra specie ad aver fatto naufragio su di una nave deserta.*"

Così, con impenitente concettosità, Roberto de la Grive, presumibilmente tra il luglio e l'agosto del 1643' (5).

Daß Ecos Romananfang mit seiner recht genauen zeitlichen Situierung andererseits an den Erzähler-Chronisten eines historischen Romans erinnert, kann an dieser Stelle nicht weiter verfolgt werden. Daß *Die Insel des vorigen Tages* über weite Strecken als historischer Roman gelesen werden kann, steht jedenfalls außer Frage.[19] Mit dem schon erwähnten Einmünden der Vorgeschichte in die Erzählgegenwart genau in der Romanmitte enden auch im Grunde die makrostrukturellen Übereinstimmungen von Heliodor und Eco. Denn die im antiken Liebesroman obligatorische glückliche finale Vereinigung des Liebespaares scheitert in Ecos Roman an den Tücken von Raum und Zeit, bzw. bleibt—bei einer optimistischen Lektüre—am Ende offen. Mit den *Aithiopika* gemeinsam hingegen hat die *Insel* einen linearen Chronotopos, während die übrigen griechischen Liebesromane einen zirkulären Chronotopos aufweisen.[20] Denn wie jene im exotisch-fernen Äthiopien am südlichen Ende der damals bekannten Welt enden, so strandet Roberto vor seiner Insel im Pazifik, wohin sich im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert das Paradies zurückgezogen hatte, nachdem sich alle anderen Gärten Eden als nicht so recht paradiesisch herausgestellt hatten.

In jedem Fall wird in Ecos Roman ebensoviel vom Reisen erzählt wie bei Heliodor und den anderen antiken Romanen mit Ausnahme von *Daphnis und Chloe*. Und auch die Reisenden werden weder von Seestürmen noch von Piraten verschont, von Schiffbrüchen nicht zu reden. Doch im Detail werden nicht unerhebliche Unterschiede manifest: Während der verliebte Theagenes die Artemispriesterin Charikleia aus Delphi entführt und das Liebespaar, von halb Delphi verfolgt, auf einem phönizischen Schiff die Flucht ergreift, auf hoher See von Piraten überfallen, im Sturm an die Herakleotische Nilmündung getrieben, dort von räuberischen Hirten gefangen genommen und schließlich getrennt wird, verläßt Roberto Paris getrennt von seiner geliebten Lilia auf der erzwungenen Suche nach der Insel auf dem 180. Längengrad; und es ist sein Rivale, der Bastardbruder Ferrante, der ihn, seinerseits mit der geliebten Signora vereint, verfolgt – und zwar in jeder Hinsicht vereint, wie sich der Held in seiner Eifersucht ausmalt. Hier aber sind wir in einem besonderen Part der Eco'schen *Insel* gelandet: Robertos Roman im Roman, Ausgeburt

[19] Hierzu Berger (1999) Kap. 3: 'Die Insel als historischer Roman.'
[20] Darauf hat Fusillo (1989) 29 aufmerksam gemacht.

eifersüchtiger Phantasie des nach dem Verschwinden Pater Caspars in den Fluten des Pazifiks wieder völlig vereinsamten Helden und zugleich *mise en abyme* des Romanschaffens.[21] Dementsprechend hat sich der eifersüchtige Protagonist als Schöpfer seines eigenen Romans an die Logik des Romanschaffens zu halten, die es dem Schöpfer der fiktionalen Welt auferlegt,

> [...] daß man die widerwärtigsten Leidenschaften teilt, wenn man als Frucht der eigenen Phantasie den widerwärtigsten aller Protagonisten kreiert. (382)[22]

Diese Konzeption des Romanschaffens, wonach der Autor an den psychischen Aggregatzuständen seines fiktionalen Geschöpfes teilhat, entstammt freilich weder der Antike noch der Frühen Neuzeit, sondern ist Kind der Romantik, ein im übrigen recht langlebiges Kind, das noch heute als Wiedergänger in den Köpfen vieler Romanleser und –kritiker herumspukt. Durch die Brille dieser Romankonzeption sieht Roberto eben dies, was weder bei Heliodor noch bei Mademoiselle de Scudéry und ihresgleichen auch nur im Ansatz denkbar erscheint: die Liebesvereinigung der Heldin mit einem Rivalen.

Zugleich freilich erscheint—an der Elle strikter Wahrscheinlichkeit gemessen—die unbeirrt fleckenlose Keuschheit der doch durch so viele rauhe Piratenhände gegangenen Heldin Kritikern des 17. Jahrhunderts als einer *der* neuralgischen Punkte dieser Romanform.[23]

Doch Robertos Lebenswelt generiert nicht einseitig seine Romanwelt: Diese wirkt auch mächtig auf ihren Erzeuger zurück, der nun in seiner Einsamkeit auf dem Wrack der *Daphne* die Geliebte zurückerobern will, sich ins Meer stürzt, wo er metaphern- und metamorphosengeschult in der Unterwasserwelt des Korallenriffs überall Lilias Körper wiederzufinden vermag, bis der Stich eines Steinfisches ihn aus diesen schönen Träumen reißt und ihn stattdessen in die Abgründe des Fieberwahns stürzt (Kap. 36). Doch der Fieberwahn hat auch sein Gutes: für den Ausgang seines Romans nämlich, beschließt

---

[21] Mit Egger (1988) 45 kann man freilich auch die Erzählung des Kalasiris als Roman im Roman lesen.

[22] ‘*[...] che impone di partecipare agli affetti più odiosi, quando si debba concepire come figlio della propria immaginazione il più odiosi tra i protagonisti.*’ (Eco [1994] 355).

[23] So spricht Sorel (1974) 129 von Königstöchtern, die wie leichte Mädchen mit wildfremden Männern durch die Lande ziehen.

der Held doch zwecks Herstellung der für diese Romanspezies obligatorischen poetischen Gerechtigkeit den scheußlichen Rivalen Ferrante exemplarisch zu bestrafen, nachdem dieser ruchlose Schuft seiner meuternden Besatzung Lilia als Beute versprochen hatte. Zunächst läßt er ganz in der Manier Homers den Gott der Meere einen gewaltigen Seesturm aufziehen, den sich der von Ferrante in grausamster Form gefolterte Biscarat zunutze macht, um sich einem *Deus ex machina* gleich, wie es im 38. Kapitel heißt, fürchterlich an ihm zu rächen, ihn mittels seiner Ketten zu erwürgen und gemeinsam mit ihm in den Meeresfluten zu verschwinden.

Der aus Dumas' *Drei Musketieren* bekannte Biscarat spielt hier also den Part des Werkzeugs göttlicher Gerechtigkeit, bzw. poetischer Gerechtigkeit als Kopfgeburt des Romanciers Roberto: Auf diese Funktion weist er selbst metanarrativ am Ende des 37. Kapitels hin.

Nun hat die Forschung gerade in jüngster Zeit auf ganz ähnliche Funktionen der Theatermetaphorik in den *Aithiopika* aufmerksam gemacht.[24] Mit Theatermetaphern spielt Heliodors Roman von Anfang an. Die Eingangsszene—und Romananfänge steuern ja in besonderem Maße die Aufmerksamkeit der Leser—schon die Eingangsszene arbeitet mit einer überaus hohen Dichte von Theaterbegriffen, wenn dort von einem 'Bühnenbild' die Rede ist, das eine für die 'Zuschauer' undurchsichtige 'Szene' darstellt.[25] Derart eingeführt, werden wir Leser in nicht weniger als 50 Passagen des Romans mit einem reichen Theatervokabular konfrontiert, dessen Funktion weit über die einer bloßen Visualisierung des Geschehens hinausgeht. Dies wird überdeutlich am Ende der *Aithiopika*, wo ihr Vater Hydaspes die Behauptung Charikleias, seine Tochter zu sein, unwillig-überrascht zurückweist, indem er sie als bloßen von der Theatermaschine produzierten Bühnentrick abqualifiziert (10.12.2). Als aber dank allgemeiner Wiedererkennung die Dinge definitiv eine glückliche Wendung nehmen, da greift Sisimithres—nun auch den ungläubigen Hydaspes überzeugend—nochmals die Metapher der Theatermaschine auf (10.39.2.), so daß auch dieser zugeben muß, daß 'die Dinge durch der Götter Fügung diese Wendung genommen haben'

[24] Zuletzt vor allem Paulsen (1992).
[25] Zur Eingangsszene (1.1.6-7) Paulsen (1992) 53-6.

(10.40.1).[26] Diese Rolle eines *Deus ex machina*, hatte zuvor (7.6.5) schon Kalasiris gespielt, als er Zeuge eines grausigen Schauspiels, des Zweikampfs seiner Söhne Thyamis und Petosiris, wird und in letzter Sekunde rettend eingreifen kann.

Wenn wir nun wieder zu Biscarat und Umberto Eco zurückblenden, dann wird neben Übereinstimmung zugleich Differenz offenbar: Mögen auch beide, Kalasiris und Biscarat, Werkzeuge eines Gottes sein, so bedeutet göttlicher Eingriff dort Wendung zum Guten = Leben, hier Wendung zum Schlechten = Tod, wenngleich natürlich der Tod des Bösen die Forderung nach poetischer Gerechtigkeit ebenso erfüllt wie das glückliche Leben der Guten.

Insgesamt setzt Heliodor das Leben—fast schon in der Manier barocker Metaphorik, wie Massimo Fusillo gezeigt hat[27]—kontinuierlich in Beziehung zum Theater. Insbesondere der theaterverwöhnte Athener Knemon ist es, für den erzähltes Leben aus dem Mund des Kalasiris zum Bühnenstück mutiert. So fordert er, um nur ein Beispiel zu zitieren, den alten Meistererzähler einmal ermunternd zum Weiterreden auf (2.23.5):

> Dionysos freut sich an Mythen und liebt Theaterstücke. Jetzt hat er auch bei mir seinen Einzug gehalten, wünscht, ich solle die Geschichte hören, bestürmt mich, dir den versprochenen Lohn abzufordern. Und für dich ist es an der Zeit, das Drama, wie auf der Bühne, an mir vorüberziehen zu lassen.[28]

Das Theater ist bei Heliodor freilich nicht allein in Form von metaphorischer Verwendung seiner Begrifflichkeit präsent: Es spielt darüber hinaus eine bedeutende Rolle als Intertext, wie denn überhaupt Intertextualität ein konstitutives Merkmal des antiken Romans im allgemeinen und Heliodors im besonderen bildet: Auch darauf hat u.a. Massimo Fusillo aufmerksam gemacht.[29] Neben der Tragödie[30] und vor allem der Komödie im Zusammenhang mit der Rolle der Tyche, Personenverwechslungen, Scheintoden, Wiedererkennungen,

---

[26] Zum ‘Finale in Meroë’ als ‘letzten Akt des Dramas’ mit seiner definitiven Wendung zum Guten vgl. Paulsen (1992) 75-81.

[27] Vgl. Fusillo (1989) 35.

[28] Zitiert nach Gasse (1972) 58.

[29] Fusillo (1989) passim und zuletzt Zimmermann (1997).

[30] Z.B. Euripides mit dem Bruderkampf zwischen Eteokles und Polyneikes in den Phönikierinnen als Vorbild für das Duell der Kalasiris-Söhne Thyamis und Petosiris, vgl. Fusillo (1989) 41.

dem glücklichen Ausgang der Intrige[31] sind hier in erster Linie auch Epos und Historiographie zu nennen. Diese Bezugnahmen auf anerkannte Gattungen lassen Legitimationsstrategien erkennbar werden, mit denen die Romanciers der Antike angesichts der mangelnden poetologischen Verankerung ihres eigenen Genres dieses im Gattungssystem zu etablieren suchen.[32] In den Vorreden der französischen heroisch-galanten Romane des 17. Jahrhunderts bildet sich ein poetologischer Diskurs heraus, der neben der Referenz auf das antike Modell Heliodor mit der schon erwähnten Vorrede zum *Ibrahim* das Epos als Modell propagiert, das dann auch im Traktat des Bischofs Huet gemeinsam mit Heliodor die Legitimationsfunktion übernimmt, wie sich auch schon die zeitgenössische Gattungsbezeichnung '*roman héroïque*' an das Epos, das '*poème héroïque'*, anlehnt. Mit der Historiographie aber wollen die Vertreter und Verfechter der '*romans héroïques'* unter Berufung auf ihr Prinzip der poetischen Gerechtigkeit, das die Historiker nicht erfüllen könnten, in Konkurrenz treten.

Während für Heliodor das Drama den dominierenden intertextuellen Bezugsrahmen bildet, stehen Epos und Heliodor selbst im Zentrum der Intertexte einer Madeleine de Scudéry. Umberto Eco seinerseits zündet mit seiner *Insel des vorigen Tages* ein wahres Feuerwerk der Intertextualität, in dem er eine explosive Mischung von historischen, philosophischen, naturwissenschaftlichen, aber auch literarischen—und hier nicht zuletzt romanhaften—Texten hochgehen läßt. Heliodor und Madeleine de Scudéry mögen für Ecos Roman nicht die Initialzündung abgegeben haben, mit der Rolle von Spätzündern freilich brauchen sie sich ebensowenig zu bescheiden.

Ich widme diesen Beitrag meinem Lehrer Reinhold Merkelbach, der mich vor 35 Jahren in die faszinierende Welt des antiken Romans eingeführt hat.

---

[31] Fusillo (1989) 43-52.

[32] Zu dieser Funktion der Intertextualität im antiken Roman vgl. Zimmermann (1997) 12.

FROM PETRONIUS TO *PETROLIO*: *SATYRICON* AS A MODEL-EXPERIMENTAL NOVEL

Massimo Fusillo

In an author's note written in spring 1973, Pier Paolo Pasolini introduced his unfinished novel, *Petrolio*, as follows:

> *Petrolio* as a whole (from the second draft) should be read as a critical edition of an unpublished text (considered as a monumental work, a modern-day *Satyricon*). Four or five manuscripts of this text, both consistent and inconsistent—some reporting facts while others not—survive. The reconstruction is thus based on a comparison of the various manuscripts preserved (of which, e.g., two apocrypha with bizarre, grotesque, naive, stylised variants). It is also drawn from other materials such as letters by the author (whose identity is still under debate from a philological point of view), letters from the author's friends who know of the manuscript (diverging one from the other), oral transcripts as reported in newspapers, other miscellany, songs, etc. There are also illustrations of the book (probably the work of the author himself). These illustrations are of great help in reconstructing the missing scenes and passages. Their description should be accurate, and the literary reconstruction will be complemented by a figurative, critical reconstruction, as the book's graphics are done at a very high, albeit manneristic, level. Moreover, to fill in the numerous gaps in the book and for the reader's information, an enormous quantity of historical documents that have some bearing on the book (related to politics and, in particular, to the history of ENI) will be used. These documents include: newspaper articles cited in their entirety (magazine reports, e.g., from *L'Espresso*), recordings of interviews with important figures or other witnesses, rare cinematic documents (here, there will be a critical reconstruction similar to the figurative and literary one, which is not only philological but also stylistic and determinative, e.g., "Who is the director of such and such a documentary?", etc.). Therefore, on the basis of these documents the author of the critical edition will summarise, using a flat, objective and drab style, long excerpts of general history, so that the fragments of the reconstructed work are bound to one another. Such fragments will be arranged in paragraphs by the editor. At times such fragments correspond to entire original chapters (i.e., whose text is *almost* identical in all of the manuscripts, with the exception of the apocrypha, which continue to present bizarre variants). The fragmentary nature of the entire book renders some of the 'narrative chunks' perfect *per se*, even though it cannot be understood, for exam-

> ple, if these are real facts, dreams or conjectures offered by some character.[1]

Therefore, it was the author's intention for the novel to have an unfinished character by simulating a continuous reconstruction undertaken by the editor-narrator "using a flat, objective and drab style", thus creating a sort of philological metanovel. As is well known, Pasolini was murdered two years after writing this note. By a tragic paradox, a planned incompleteness was to become an actual incompleteness. The novel we read, published posthumously (twenty years after his death in a critical edition), brings together fragments, handwritten and typed notes, as well as finished and drafted excerpts in some six hundred pages out of the approximately two thousand planned by the author. *Petrolio,* however, is an intrinsically unending work, which rejects any structure or literary convention: perhaps it could not have ended other than with the author's death. Moreover, Pasolini had already conceived another work based on the technique of incompleteness, *The Divine Mimesis,* as the posthumous critical edition of the text of an author bludgeoned to death in Palermo.

An important intertextual signal (these abound throughout the novel) can be found between brackets: namely, *Petrolio* should emerge "as a monumental work, a modern-day *Satyricon*". This was a reference to an ancient text, of which only fragments have survived, whose elusive plot we have continuously to reconstruct in its entirety, and whose author has been the subject of some controversy. The parallels are not limited to the surface form of the texts, which are composed of the extracts of a (great) lost work. As has often happened throughout the history of modern prose, *Satyricon* serves as the paradigm for any experimental open form which defies normal literary taxonomy and is based on the relentless contamination of *languages*.

Let us now examine the common points between Petronius and *Petrolio*. First, the narration is characterised by picaresque progression, or "swarming", as defined by Pasolini himself citing an essay by Shklovsky on Sterne (another frequently evoked paradigmatic figure).[2] Hence, there is a continuous succession of episodes in free association, often produced by the chronotope of casual encounters, beyond the typical organic and centripetal structure of the ancient

---

[1] See Pier Paolo Pasolini, *Petrolio,* in Pasolini (1998) 1161-2 (Engl. transl.).

[2] See Pasolini (1998) App. 22a, implicitly quoting Shklovsky's *Theory of the prose*; the work on Sterne is quoted in App. 6 sexies and App. 20.

Greek novel or the great modern realistic novel. This open form allows for the use of richly versatile material, which brings us to the second point: namely, both novels are encyclopaedic. Indeed, *Satyricon* contains digressions on the art of rhetoric, painting, and various aspects of the world at that time. In the same way, *Petrolio*'s narration is often broken by metanarrative and metaliterary comments, or by long political, journalistic or essayistic insets. Fuelled by satirical tension, these asides also retrace Italian history of the 1960s, ranging from unruly modernisation to oil company scandals and the corruption of power and the bourgeoisie (the author's note also provides for the use of figurative and documentary material).

Without a doubt, this thematic polyphony corresponds to a polyphony of expression. Indeed, Pasolini had always been fascinated by multilingualism and multistylisation, so perfectly epitomised by Petronius. However, in *Petrolio* this element is continuously played down, to the point of being reduced to a medical report or to the remnants of a lost past as the result of cultural and linguistic homologation that the author fought so bitterly. A particularly salient example of multistylisation appears in the form of prosimetrum. Petronius' variegated use of this trope, from brief, parodic quotations to long, autonomous insets (e.g. *Iliupersis*), is well known. We can also find a series of brief poetic quotations in *Petrolio,* which range from Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* to Villon and Shakespeare and which function fundamentally as a lyrical counterpoint that breaks up the flow of the story. Furthermore, Pasolini had also planned to include a long adaptation of Apollonius of Rhodes' *Argonautica,* set in modern times and with the Golden Fleece replaced by that precious element *par excellence* of fully developed neo-capitalism, black gold, i.e. petroleum, which gives the novel its title. Pasolini had intended to write this part in Greek, specifically in Kavafis' neo-Greek, thereby producing, instead of a translation, a telegraphic summary in the paragraph titles (this is all that has actually survived among his papers and suggests a familiarity with Apollonius' text unusual for non-specialist readers of the time). Hence, this was a 'stylistic eccentricity,' a sort of graphic estrangement, which recalls some of the devices of the neo-avant-garde so disliked by Pasolini.

We should recall yet another meaning, in this case thematic, inherent in the definition of a 'modern *Satyricon*': the frequency of sexual promiscuity and homoeroticism, which clearly sets Petronius

apart from the Greek novel and constitutes one of its most significant peculiarities. In any case, these two themes are essentially Pasolinian, and in *Petrolio* they are expressed through the main character's splitting, between a demonic sexuality and his search for power (the names for the two doubles are Carlo di Tetis[3] and Carlo di Polis). However, even in these aspects there is no doubt that Pasolini was still drawing from *Satyricon*.

All the elements outlined thus far—the picaresque progression, encyclopaedism, multistylisation, prosimetrum, sexual polymorphism—fall within an idea of the novel as an open and polycentric form, very close to that long-standing cultural trend that Bakhtin calls Menippean.[4] This was an underground, marginal genre, in continuous mutation, which, according to the Russian theoretician, represents one of the most important forerunners to the modern polyphonic novel. As a matter of fact, classifying literary genre in Petronius' work has always been controversial. This is also due to the rather evasive character of the documents on Menippean satire, with which, among other things, Petronius seems to have little in common (*Satyricon* can be better defined, from my point of view, as a comic-realistic novel).[5] On the other hand, in the last volume of his monumental *History of Modern Criticism*, René Wellek justly criticises Bakhtin's definition of Menippea as being overly generic, since he gives too much importance to constants at the expense of variants.[6] True as these reservations may be, many of Bakhtin's theories can still be salvaged as long as Menippea is not considered a literary genre, for its outline would indeed be too ephemeral. Rather, it should be considered a cultural trend spanning various eras and genres: a trend characterised by a great stylistic and formal liberty, and inevitably associated with low, corporeal, grotesque and obscene themes, which are all central to both Petronius and *Petrolio*.

This Menippean tendency towards a free and relatively unstructured form is clearly evident at the beginning of Pasolini's novel, to which we shall now turn. In addition, this discussion will allow us to include other works of ancient prose.[7] The first annotation of the

---

[3] The name comes from the strange idea that in ancient Greek 'Thetis' would mean sex.

[4] See Bakhtin (1981).

[5] See the recent work by Conte (1997) chapter V; see also Schmeling (1996b).

[6] Wellek (1991) chapter XV.

[7] Here I resume parts of Fusillo (2001).

novel is entitled *Background Notes*, and was purposely left blank with three lines of dots and a footnote which claims: "The novel has no beginning." Thus, this is a clear denial of a convention at the basis of any literary creation: the incipit, the demiurgical act by which the novelist initiates his possible world. Such a denial was a *Leitmotiv* in all of Pasolini's work: his desire to transcend the suffocating conventionality of language, at first through his youthful poems in his precious Friulian dialect, then through his novels in the Roman dialect of the lumpenproletarian housing estates, and finally through his films. He regarded the cinema as a pre-grammatical, barbaric and visionary art that made it possible to exploit non-verbal language such as dance, gesture, ritual, myth, and the sacred, while his poetry became decreasingly expressionistic and increasingly barren and journalistic. Therefore, in Pasolini's second period there is a denial of the literary institution and its conventions, epitomised by *Petrolio*'s lack of incipit. In all likelihood, this refusal does not derive from a late Romantic point of view, which would imply resorting to a mythology of spontaneity and authenticity. As all writers of the time, Pasolini was fully aware that conventions are an unavoidable element of any form of communication, and particularly of literature. In fact, as argued by Mukarovský, they are a premise to its sociality.[8] What Pasolini rejected was time-consuming and tiresome rewritings, that sense of exhaustion and ending which is the key feature of Postmodernism. This was what characterised, for example, the work of Italo Calvino, who at the time was writing *If on a Winter's Night a Traveller*, a novel that raises the incipit as a strategy to seduce the reader, multiplying it and thereby demystifying it, although within the framework of hyperconvention.[9]

Thus, rejecting the incipit is a way of stressing an idea of literature as direct action on reality, or as true performance, with all its narcissistic self-referentiality. This means, in a wider sense, rejecting the very premise of the novel's form. During his last period, Pasolini obsessively refuses closed and definitive forms in favour of the potential of a project. Among his film work, we might recall *Appunti per un film sull'India* [*Notes for a Film on India*] (1967-68) and *Appunti per un'Orestiade Africana* [*Notes for an African Oresteia*] (1969-73),

[8] Mukařovský (1936); Engl. transl. Suino (1979).

[9] On the opposition between the two Italian writers and their ideas of literature see Benedetti (1998).

films on films to be made in the future, which, however, retain their own expressive autonomy, and in which the author continuously intervenes to clarify and discuss his main idea, giving a fascinating mixture of fiction and self-commentary. In addition, among his literary works we can cite various poems such as *Projects for Future Works*, *A Dispatch to ANSA*, and especially the *Divine Mimesis*, which appeared posthumously in 1975, but in the edition authorised by Pasolini. This latter work presented the same juxtaposition of literary, documentary and figurative materials as did *Petrolio*; in Pasolini's words this was "the magmatic and progressive form of reality (that does not cancel anything, that makes the past and present coexist)".[10] All these works were for the most part composed of conative utterances on what the definitive text should be like and comments on its meaning and themes. In these works what prevails, according to Genette's definition, is the narrator's *ideological function* (or *interpretative function*), always subordinate to the story of a traditional novel and completely eliminated by naturalism.[11] The undisputed master is the author, who is in no way implicit and who also puts into the work his own provocative jest of an impure writing, as well as his body and his Eros in an action that can be compared to body art performances and the obliterations of Concept Art and Art pauvre.

At the same time that his poetry and literature were showing signs of a 'loss of faith,' Pasolini's Marxist and Freudian ideology were becoming more subdued. Increasingly Pasolini preferred the cyclicity of agrarian culture, for which Greek mythology is often a metaphor, to the teleology of these two currents. However, it appears that this position was preceded by the crisis of yet another movement, i.e. French Structuralism with which Pasolini had strong yet ambivalent ties. He criticised its Cartesian roots, which led to a preference for static elements over dynamic processes. A fundamental premise to structuralist and semiological criticism is the idea that a literary 'specificity' could be defined: a set of abstract properties capable of identifying 'literariness', a concept vehemently disputed by the currents of so-called Post-Structuralism. *Petrolio* would appear to be consistent with the latter movement, beyond the possible, albeit improbable, direct contacts. This is especially true of the denial of the

---

[10] See Pier Paolo Pasolini, *La Divina Mimesis,* in Pasolini (1998) 1117.
[11] Genette (1972); Engl. transl. Lewin (1980); Genette (1983).

separateness and specificity of literary writing, constantly contaminated by social discourse (the very same contamination applied today by the critics of American New Historicism). Such refusal is perfectly depicted by the blank lines of the beginning of the novel and the negated sentence in the footnote, "this novel has no beginning," as the only text.

The blank page that opens *Petrolio* with the footnote's negation of the beginning is a radical solution. This absolute peculiarity has no parallels unless we go back to the 18th-century metanovel (e.g. in Sterne's marbled page used as a metaphor for his own writing), or to the Dadaist provocations and other experimentations of historical avant-garde movements. This does not mean, however, that less direct precursors cannot be found in other crucial periods in Western prose. These intentionally elude an organic structure with a well-motivated beginning, main body and ending that Aristotle theorised in the *Poetics*, and that, before him, Plato had expressed through a similarity with a living organism, inevitably endowed with a head and legs.[12]

Lucian's dialogues represent an important stepping stone in the Menippean trend, especially those more satiric than essayistic, with a dramatic framework and a main character who is the philosopher Menippus himself, the hero-ideologist, as defined by Bakhtin. These dialogues are the epitome of comedy lowering myth and degrading it to the grotesque, but within a particularly irregular framework. Throughout ancient literature the incipit played a decisive role: from epic proems, in which the poet received authority from the Muses, to dramatic prologues, which present various strategies to throw the spectator into the action, and on to all other literary genres in which the beginning becomes a place to express poetic manifestos, to create suspense, or to other ends, which inevitably play an important role.[13] The beginning has also been a topic addressed by literary criticism from its very origins. For example, in Aristophanes' *Frogs* Aeschylus and Euripides pitilessly analyse each other's prologues. In his satirical pastiche *True Histories* (2.20) Lucian targets his irony against a presumably wide-ranging critical debate on the *Iliad*'s incipit: in the episode about the island of the blessed (i.e. in an otherworldly setting

[12] See Clay (1992).
[13] See especially Race (1992) and Segal (1992).

typical of Menippea) the narrator meets Homer's soul and asks a series of questions which vexed ancient scholars, and, obviously, receives paradoxical answers. Finally, the narrator asks why he had begun the *Iliad* with the word 'wrath': the divine poet answers that it was the first word that had come to mind at the time. Thus, the most canonical incipit, the beginning of beginnings, noted for its thematic meaningfulness, is completely demystified.

Lucian tends to begin some of his dialogues *ex abrupto,* throwing the reader into an already begun action or conversation, as if he were highlighting the arbitrariness or fortuitousness of the reader's incursion into the narration's flow. It is an elliptical type of beginning that was to be widely used in the realistic novel, as a means to fuel the reader's expectations, thereby creating the impression that the story was an uninterrupted flow which he suddenly invades. In Lucian's work this is a technique that can be observed especially in the dialogues with Menippean subject-matter, or when the cynical philosopher is present, as in *Charon* or the *Icaromenippus*, both characterised by the device of estranged observation of reality from above that was to become popular in modern satiric literature.[14] Furthermore, this device was used in the passionate philosophical satire *Sale of Lives* and in its apologising continuation *The Fisherman or The Dead Come To Life,* both with particularly effective dramatic beginnings (in the former Zeus is organising an auction of philosophic lives, while in the latter Socrates is instigating philosophers to beat Lucian).

Moreover, the second dialogue is interesting because the incipit contains a lengthy exchange of poetic citations between Parrhesiades (i.e. Lucian) and Plato that is completely disconnected from the main action (only after the prosimetrical scene does one discover the reason behind the philosophers' aggression towards the author, a solution that was to be used again in *The Runaways*). As already noted, poetic citation in a work of prose is one of the favourite devices of Menippean provocation because it unhinges the principle of stylistic unity as codified by the ancient rhetors by introducing comic discordances and allowing for the ludic degradation of sublime models. From this point of view, the most interesting example is the incipit of *Zeus the Tragedian,* an Epicurean-inspired dialogue in which the

[14] See Von Koppenfels (1981).

proto-Enlightenment criticism is particularly bitter, and in which the king of the gods appears ‘dethroned’ and distressed since the lack of sacrifices can starve the gods to death. The beginning is entirely in verse: first Hermes, with a series of paratragic iambic triameters, and then Athena, with a pastiche of Homeric hexameters, ask Zeus why he is so distressed. The king of the gods responds, quoting the incipit of Euripides’ *Orestes* modified in such a way that it is adapted to the human-divine reversal, which forms the basis of the dialogue. Euripides’ verses are: “There is no word so cruel to be said, no sufferance, no calamity sent by the gods, whose burden human nature cannot bear” (verses 1-3). Here “sent by the gods” (θεήλατη) is replaced by the metaliterary “worthy of tragedy” (τραγῳδική), and “human nature” is obviously replaced by “the nature of the gods” (according to variant G). The exchange of citations from Euripides continues for some time until Hera comes to the point with the intertextual play on words: “Stop your wrath, Zeus; I do not know how to play comedies, nor recite poems, as these people do, nor have I stomached Euripedes’ complete works only to play a supporting role in the drama.” As in *The Fisherman*, only now, after the independent and disjointed scene in prosimetrum, do we discover the reason for Zeus’ distress. It is, therefore, a beginning without any informative or dramatising function that is resolved only in the demystification of the mythical tradition and in the assemblage of paradoxically recycled citations.

Hence, an ancient precursor to the Pasolinian negation of the beginning can be found in a hybrid serious-comical genre, which lacks epic aura and is written completely in the present, as are Lucian’s dialogues. (Here, we might also recall the humorous incipit of Seneca’s *Apokolokynthosis*, the only extant genuine Menippean satire.) On the other hand, the Greek novel is characterised by an absolutely functional type of incipit, which presents the reader with the place of action and the two main characters, or the couple of the love story. However, there are many noteworthy variants, which inevitably entail a loss of the beginning’s importance. These include Chariton’s paratextual beginning signed by the author, the everyday life of Achilles Tatius, who comes closest to comedy, Longus’ more sophisticated beginning, in which the action appears to be part of a picture, and Heliodorus’ drastic Odyssean innovation, narrated from

a typically Jamesian restricted perspective.[15] Therefore, it would appear that the incipit in the ancient novel underwent a similar development in the modern novel. It started with a ritualised beginning, coinciding with the beginning of the story and characterised by the marked presence of a narrating voice with an explanatory function, and was transformed into a beginning from which the narrator eliminated himself, throwing the reader directly into the action and thereby stimulating an action of decoding. By contrast, the parodic current of the metanovel (e.g. Cervantes, Sterne, Diderot, and perhaps even Petronius) stands out for its more clear-cut and radical solutions.

Unfortunately, we have neither the beginning nor the end of Petronius' *Satyricon*, but we can deduce from the extant fragments, as maintained by Gareth Schmeling who hypothesised an open, picaresque ending or 'anticlosure,'[16] that the structure was intentionally unsystematised and in no way Aristotelian. The same structure can be found in Lucian's above-mentioned dialogues, and was also evoked by Pasolini in his own definition of *Petrolio* as a modern *Satyricon*.

In conclusion, let us recall that *Petrolio* is not the only example in Italian prose from the second half of the 20th century that makes reference to Petronius. In addition to adaptations belonging to other genres—e.g. the famous visionary Jungian film by Fellini and Bruno Maderna's 'multilingual' opera, a musical parody of the *Cena*—we should also recall the free pastiche translation, or 'carbon copy novel,' by one of the leading figures of the Italian neo-avant-garde, Edoardo Sanguineti (*Il gioco del Satyricon*, 1970). Finally, we should recall the change of setting to modern times, according to a technique which Genette calls 'heterodiegetic transformation', by Luca Canali, published in 2000. However, we should not fail to mention Alberto Arbasino, who in his own right shared with Pasolini a close friendship, although not always without its disagreements. In his essays in *Certi romanzi,* Arbasino theorised a new Menippean satire and considered *Satyricon* a model for a novel based on continuous digressions and free conversations, namely, on the ironical and cynical observation of contemporary customs. This is a long way from the dark and desperate tones of *Petrolio,* which persist even at moments of

[15] See García Gual (2001).
[16] Schmeling (1991).

grotesque, comic effect. (In one of his notes, we can read: "I have erected a monument to laughter.") From his masterpiece *Fratelli d'Italia* (1963) to the more recent *Le Muse a Los Angeles* (2000), an excursion through the paintings of the museums of the West Coast, Arbasino chooses an amused and light-hearted tone, especially adopted to recount homosexual Eros. This is one final example of how a novel that is many-sided, polyphonic, ambiguous and elusive such as *Satyricon* can generate such highly different and peculiar receptions.

This page intentionally left blank

MYTHS OF PERSON AND PLACE: THE SEARCH FOR A MODEL FOR THE ANCIENT GREEK NOVEL

Gareth Schmeling

The Myth of the Heroine

For the five Greek and three Latin novels which survive whole, all of the Greek and two of the Latin have young heroines of such outstanding beauty that they have become the subject of discussion by all people. The word heroine is probably too generous for what might better be the female protagonist. There is little that is heroic about these very young women except perhaps in their ability to survive. The passive nature of the female protagonist is almost as disconcerting as that of the male and appears to many modern readers as a defect in the characterization. For many modern readers the success of most forms of classical literature rests on the depth of the characters portrayed: Achilles, Antigone, Clytemnestra, Oedipus, Dido, even Aeneas.[1]

Since almost all female protagonists are more or less passive, perhaps it was a tenet of the genre of the ancient novel that they were expected to be passive: the heroine of the Greek novel was never meant to be dominant like Antigone or Clytemnestra. For a partner the female protagonist chooses an equally passive male.[2]

---

[1] My problems with the passive nature of the protagonists in the Greek novel might be a fault in my perception. If the ancient Greek novel is infused with the spirit of romantic love, the passivity of the hero and heroine could be natural, as Frye (1976) 88 explains: "With the rise of the romantic ethos heroism comes increasingly to be thought of in terms of suffering, endurance, and patience." Beye (1982) 71ff. seems to conclude that the ancient novel stands in a long line of works in which romantic love is operative. Rudd (1981) 140-58 picks his way carefully through the minefield of the literary tradition involving romantic love and concludes that while courtly love has no classical precedent, romantic love does. He rejects the premise of C.S. Lewis (1936) 4 that romantic love was known in the West only after the 11th century. For a structural analysis of the passive hero/heroine, cf. Nolting-Hauff (1974) 417-55.

[2] Egger (1990) 175ff. comments on the passivity of the hero vis-à-vis the heroine and these two vis-à-vis other characters.

The Myth of Person

The passive nature of the heroine and hero of the ancient Greek novels strikes us at first as outside the tradition: it was the Greeks after all who gave the Western world the first and most influential concept of a hero and heroine. At the literary level of the novel, however, the tradition of the hero seems to have changed. As Reardon ([1991] 46) has demonstrated, we do not really know what the ancients thought of the ancient Greek novel, unless their virtual silence indicates disapproval.[3] The result is that we do not know how or why this change from aggressive to passive protagonists occurred, nor do we have a clue as to what the ancients made of it, if anything. We are thus left to our own devices.

If it were possible for us to find a modern parallel to the Greek novel and to its passive protagonists, we might be able to come to a better understanding of the nature of this new genre. Even though the ancient Greek novel has only a limited influence on later literature, it seems best not to consider any of those later writers and works suspected of being influenced by the Greek novel, because we would not have an independent judgment but a continuation, a copy, as it were, of the original. Thus we shall want to exclude from consideration as modern parallels those authors like Richardson, Fielding, Sidney, Baudion, Aleman whom Wolff, Turner, or Sandy have identified as writers (probably) influenced by the Greek novelists.[4] Well known composers of romance like Walter Scott and William Ainsworth prove that all romances have something in common,[5] but they do not nicely address our special concern of passive protagonists.

This paper is thus *not* a study of the reception or Nachleben of the ancient Greek novel in modern literature, but an attempt to find another group of novels, quite unrelated to the Greek novels, which shows, however, a number of literary similarities to the Greek novels and also similarities in social institutions which help to give rise to its popularity. In our search for a theoretical basis for an origin of the Greek novel and why the Greek novel is the kind of novel it is and

---

[3] A letter (No. 66) attributed to Philostratus is addressed to a Chariton and claims that no one is interested in Chariton's work; cf. Schmeling (1974) 160-5.

[4] Wolff (1912); Turner (1968-69) 15-24; Sandy (1982); (1979) 41-55; (1996) 735-73.

[5] Frye (1976).

not something else, perhaps we can find a society widely separated in time and place from ancient Greece, but in which as in Greece the novel was a response (an attempt to seek a personal identity) to the situation in which a group of people found themselves.

The Myth of the Belle

There exists a sub-species of the contemporary American novel which appears to be elucidative for our experiment: novels about the American 'Old South' before the Civil War of 1861-1865, novels in which the female protagonists are referred to (as a class) as Southern Belles. Perhaps the most popular example of this genre (although written about one hundred years into its development) is Margaret Mitchell's *Gone with the Wind*. As in most Greek novels, the chief actor in these modern works about the Southern Belle is a young woman. As in the debate over whether we should entitle Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe* simply *Callirhoe*, so we could justly call *Gone with the Wind* by the name of the heroine, *Scarlett*.[6] The genre seems to have its origins with John P. Kennedy's *Swallow Barn* (1832), in which we meet the first Southern Belle, Bel Tracy. The Southern Belle is an adolescent of sixteen years or so, unmarried (inexperienced in every way) but ripe for marriage, carefully protected (but everyone knows of her beauty), the daughter of a wealthy family (more or less aristocratic, but vaguely so and without any official title), unschooled in matters of husband-catching but expected to catch a husband anyway, and unripe for dealing with the real world.[7]

The antebellum Southern Belle novel shows a young, almost always motherless, woman who finds her whole existence and fulfillment (the plot of the novel) on the plantation; the males (father and brothers) about her are domineering and in search of material possessions. The young Belle is influential on her father's plantation and is reluctant to marry anyone, even someone chosen by her father whom she adores. After a time the Belle (sexually modest and moral, but beautiful) reconsiders an offer from a neighbor's son (e.g.) and marries him (he is always wealthy). The Civil War changes the Southern Belle novel: as the South falls so does the Belle. In a devastated

[6] Reardon (1991) 118, "…the romance is Callirhoe's story."
[7] On the social myth created for the Greek novel, cf. Reardon (1969) 291-309.

South she becomes the champion (replacing the male) and spokesman for the South: she defends gentile plantation life (and slavery) and points out that the North won the war only because it had more guns. Southern men are defeated on the battlefield, while Southern Belles remain virgins. As the South struggles to cope with loss of status and to learn how to survive in this new Northern dominated environment, so does the Belle learn to prosper. Her sexual allure which she suppressed in the earlier plantation novels, she now has need of and employs to her advantage. The Belle moves from a satisfactory/unsatisfactory status as the queen (she has no mother) on her father's plantation to a new, married state (a goal of dubious quality) on another plantation which offers her a new, but not really different, satisfactory/unsatisfactory status. It is the story of a young woman maturing, who survives because of her inner strengths and what she values in herself, rather than the help she receives from the outsiders or from what the outsiders think of her.

While exploring the absence of limits to the form of the Greek novel, Reardon ([1991] 134) seeks support for his argument by comparing it profitably with New Comedy and concludes, "Once again it can be instructive to set them (i.e. Greek novels) against their like in another genre." I was pleased when I read Reardon's observation that he saw Margaret Mitchell's *Gone With the Wind* as a form "that romance has taken in our own day,"[8] and I would like to take Reardon's suggestion and to carry it to extremes, not in form but in time. It had been some years earlier, while I was working on Petronius and had read Frances Newman's *The Short Story's Mutations from Petronius to Paul Morand* (1924), and from there moved on to her two novels about the Southern Belle, *The Hard-Boiled Virgin* (1926) and *Dead Lovers are Faithful Lovers* (1928), that I became interested in exploring the similarities between ancient Greek novels and the so-called romances of the Old South. Even the casual reader is struck, for example, by the recurring motif of 'dead lovers are faithful lovers' in Chariton, Xenophon of Ephesus (3.6), Achilles Tatius and the *Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri*. The novels about the Southern Belle are immensely popular in the United States, not only in the South but

[8] Reardon (1991) 175. The form of the romance/novel has, according to Frye (1976) 4, remained stable: "The conventions of prose romance show little change over the course of centuries, and conservatism of this kind is the mark of a stable genre."

perhaps even more so in the North. *Gone with the Wind* has never been out-of-print since it was first published in 1936 and remains a perennial best-seller even in the twenty-first century; since the Civil War, novels about the Southern Belle have regularly been found on the best-seller lists of *The New York Times*. Hägg terms the late ancient novels 'popular' books,[9] but Stephens in tallying the number of literary papyri found in Egypt notes that "one and one-half times as much New Comedy and Menander" survives there as ancient novels. While Stephens ([1990] 148-9) concludes from such statistics that ancient novels were "not 'popular' with the denizens of Roman Egypt," I would argue that the popularity of New Comedy was relatively high and that the ancient novel compares favorably with that well-known genre.[10]

Whether ancient novels had many readers or were only moderately popular, they did have some measurable readership. But as Reardon and others have pointed out, they evoked no measurable critical reaction. For the sake of argument then let us assume ex silentio that the ancient critics ignored the ancient novel as a group because they felt it lacked merit, worth, or usefulness. To the model constructed by Seidel ([1985] 44-5) who explains why the Southern Belle novels of writers like Newman were ignored or unappreciated, we might appeal in our search for answers to explain why *Callirhoe, Parthenope,* and *Charicleia* were undervalued. Seidel observes that contemporary critics disregard Newman's novels of the Southern Belle because they value logical analysis and rationalism in characters and underrate features articulated by emotion and intuition; the critics "celebrated the male experience (and) denigrated the female." Since actions in the ancient novel are often guided by views derived from the emotional compass of the heroine (or an evil woman like Arsace) or by opinions dependent on her intuition, ancient critics might have concluded that the genre was outside the parameters of serious and worthwhile literature. As the novel of the Southern Belle is more than just another novel about the trials and tribulations of a beautiful young woman, so the ancient Greek novel is much more

[9] Hägg (1983) 125-53; the term 'popular' is surely related to the readership of the ancient novel; cf. Bowie (1996).

[10] On *letteratura di consumo* and the ephemeral nature of popular literature, cf. Cavallo (1996) and Stramaglia (1996), in fact all of the essays in Pecere, Stramaglia (1996).

than a romantic story about a *Liebespaar*. Both sets of novels represent another way for the modern reader to look at what earlier societies thought of themselves. Reardon's ([1991] 172) observations about the nature of the ancient Greek novel apply almost as well to the early novels of the Southern Belle: "A story like Chariton's is a fable, representing a specific social reality, the large world of Hellenistic and early imperial times. The private individual is lost in a world too big for him, isolated by involuntary travels from the society of his own people, and assailed by the dangers inherent in travel – to the point, even, of suffering apparent death; but he is recovered and sustained by love of, and fidelity to, his partner and his god, ultimately to find therein his salvation, his private happiness, and his very identity."

The Myth of Place

The location of the action of the ancient novels is roughly the eastern half of the Mediterranean world. The places are real in that the reader recognizes them as somehow familiar, but fictional in that the reader never saw such beautiful actors or experienced the confluence of such bizarre events.[11] The place for the action of the novel is a place from myth because it is inhabited by a youth and maiden of such unbelievable beauty that all the other actors hold them to be deities. The setting is not at all wildly unreal; it is, however, a place described in mythical trappings, focused on the action of a myth, and fit for actors who have achieved the status of myth.[12]

Most Greek novels seem to have little interest in the reality of place and rather more in the myth of place: a pre-Roman world in which Syracuse is mightier than Athens. Into these mythical places (Syracuse or the Southern plantation) comes the Belle who assumes the central role in the myth. She is the unofficial queen or symbol of Syracuse or of the plantation in the South. As long as Callirhoe is safe in Syracuse, or the Southern Belle virginal in her plantation, the myth of place is in equilibrium. There is, however, the seed of destruction already in place in this myth: the sexuality of the hero-

[11] Bowie (1977) 91-6 and the description of realism; Hägg (1987) 187-90.

[12] Egger (1990) 227: "The Greek novelists are not fantasizing out of the blue, but with a concrete image of the past in their minds."

ine/belle. She is as beautiful and pure as a goddess on the one hand, but on the other her beauty attracts men and her desires draw her toward sexual unions. It is this latter element of beauty/desire which by its very nature will cause problems for the heroine/belle. Deconstruction is built into the nature of this myth.

For the actors in Chariton's novel the defining moment for Syracuse is 413 B.C. and its defeat of the Athenian fleet. But Chariton passes in silence over Rome's three-hundred-year domination of Syracuse and returns to earlier days, which then assume epic proportions, almost like those of Troy. And so the mythology of Syracuse grows, and the actual past gives way before the mythological. The heroic action of Hermocrates and the Syracusans allows the first century A.D. Syracusans to project themselves back to their ancestors and allows Chariton to create a myth which eternalizes a way of life long since destroyed.

Through the media of myth and folktale a society attempts to address concerns of all kinds, and some elements of these myths and folktales find their way eventually into various kinds of literature and provide material especially for the writers of romance, who later lay down a parallel or alternative in imaginative prose fiction, works which Frye ([1976] 6) terms examples of secular scripture: "Every human society ... has some form of verbal culture, in which fictions, or stories, have a prominent place. Some of these stories may seem more important than others: they illustrate what primarily concerns their society. They help to explain certain features in that society's religion, laws, social structure, environment, history, or cosmology." We shall see in what follows how perceptive Frye's observations are.

In similar fashion the South looks past its defeat in the Civil War to happier days, to an agricultural life based on stable values, and claims these same values for itself. Both Chariton and authors of Southern Belle novels escape the present. Feelings of insignificance and weakness are palliated by harking back to the old values: political pride, social graces, the worship of feminine beauty, and a golden age culture superior to the current age of iron. If Rome has military power, then Greece has the power of culture. This myth of the past focuses its values not so much on the old aggressive military hero, who would be too similar to the Roman overlords, but on heroes with finer sensibilities and on heroines with even finer. Evil women are sexually aggressive, and Greek novel heroines and Southern Belles

are passive: these are the prevailing conventions of the genre, and heroines are for the most part held captive by that convention.

It is perhaps more accurate to say that most Greek novelists ignore the existence of the Romans rather than that the dramatic time is pre-Roman. The Mediterranean world of the Greek novelists is simply un-Roman, and we are presented with a Classical and Hellenistic Greek social existence which never dies: the world of the Greek novelists becomes another part of the great mythological past of all Greeks. This continuous myth-creation is for Frye ([1976] 14) an indication of the romance writer's mind at work: "A mythological universe is a vision of reality in terms of human concerns and hopes and anxieties ....Unfortunately, human nature being what it is, man first acquires a mythological universe and then pretends as long as he can that it is also the actual universe."

For the first three centuries of our era in many rural areas of Asia Minor, Phoenicia, and North Africa wealth was concentrated in the hands of outsiders, a small number of Romans and a much larger number of Greeks or Hellenized locals. MacMullen ([1974] 22) observes "... the bulk of real property belonged not to the peasant but to someone who did no work himself and who, more often than not, lived elsewhere. When he did appear, it was as a master; when he took up residence, local office was his natural due." In commenting on this world and the world of the Greek novel Egger ([1990] 158) relates that there exists "a colonial elite owning the land of the majorities of non-Hellenized poor peoples." She goes on to comment that for the readers of the Greek novels "the leading fantasy is that the Greek protagonists, in leaving the secure, organized realm of their cities for foreign untamed landscapes, peopled with non-civilized brigands, brutal despots, and generally unpredictable human beings, fall prey to their greed, but manage to resist and escape."

This description of society fits not only the Greek novels, it also applies to the novels of the Southern Belle. Most of the wealthy southern planters were immigrants to the United States from Britain, colonial elite who lived in places like New Orleans, Natchez, Atlanta and Charleston, while their plantations were managed by overseers. The newly elite found an underclass of poor individuals to which it added slaves. Dionysius would have fit a role as well in a novel about the Old South as he did in Chariton. The Southern Belle is the daughter of such an aristocratic British colonist. There are numerous

other kinds of person on the plantation, some free, most slaves, all of whom are there to serve her father. She will find her future husband among the sons of similar 'aristocratic' men. As the Greek protagonists of the novels feel uneasy away from their enclave, so the Southern Belle feels confused in the barbarian North with its aggressive business practices and oppressive commercialism; as the Greeks feel superior to their barbarian neighbors and Roman captors, so Southerners feel their way of life to be superior to that of Northerners.[13] If the North does not exactly represent the abode of strange Hyperboreans, it is nevertheless foreign territory and populated by people comparable to barbarians. The experiences of the heroine of the Greek novel who is almost certain to find herself in trouble when she leaves the protection of her city and ventures out on the sea, into the countryside, or to a foreign port, find a modern parallel in the Southern Belle who risks travel to the North and thus imperils her gentle upbringing, fine manners, and sexual modesty.

Whether it is Chariton placing his characters in Syracuse, Xenophon his in Ephesus, Longus his on Lesbos, or Heliodorus his in Delphi and in Egypt, the "influence of place is astonishing."[14] These novels are tied to very specific places, which, once chosen, support and contribute to the rich texture of the novel. The characters, plot, and action of the novel about the Southern Belle are likewise governed by the influence of place, in this case the plantation.

The heroines and heroes of the Greek novels belong to the upper-class of Greek landowners, old and established families. The leading characters in novels about the Southern Belle are upper-class Southern landowners who claim some kind of connection with aristocratic families still in Europe, and, who by frequently alluding to their antique past, connect themselves to the continuum of European civilization and culture. Chariton completely ignores the Romans and jumps back to the great days of Greek leadership in Syracuse—when Syracuse could defeat an Athenian fleet—and by association connects first-second century A.D. Greeks to the aristocrats of old. The

---

[13] Cash (1941); Baker (1983).
[14] Seidel (1985) 4.

Syracuse of Chariton's time is beautiful but has become unimportant; its faded glory makes it susceptible to myth-creation.[15]

While there are some traditional reasons why free Greek women are segregated in social circumstances and even secluded from men in their homes, a special result is that these women are idealized;[16] they are not part of rough, mean, everyday life with its constant competition for money and power; their glory is their beauty coupled with passive resignation. At age fourteen Anthia under the supervision of her mother makes her first ever appearance in public and then only because it is a religious festival. Though not carried to the same extremes in segregation and seclusion, a similar veneration occurs in the Old South among its Southern Belles, who are universally idealized and in fact become symbols for the Old South. The Southern Belle, virgin and undefiled and chaperoned at all times, is for many southerners the symbol of the South. Cash ([1941] 86) connects her to the Greek world and calls her the "mystic symbol of its nationality ... the shield-bearing Athena ... the hunting goddess of the Boeotian hill." When Callirhoe becomes ill with love-sickness, when Hermocrates hesitates to allow her to marry Chaereas, when Chaereas is on trial for her murder, when it is discovered that her body has been snatched from the tomb, when Theron is tried for her abduction, and when she comes home to Syracuse at the end of the novel, the whole city of Syracuse runs to attend her or to hear the news about her, as if she were the patron saint of the city come to visit her followers. She had become a symbol for Syracuse; the mark of her honor is at first her virginity, then her chastity.

As Seidel ([1985] 6) observes about the Southern Belle that her "career ... was not long-lived," so too the career of the Greek novel heroine. Both are secluded before marriage, both are allotted a brief period of excitement in finding a husband, and once married—the highpoint and purpose for existence—they move back into seclusion and live happily ever after. All three phases of her life are passive in nature. What makes possible a story about the young protagonist of the Greek novel or the Southern Belle, young women whom we would expect from the description above to lead the dullest of lives,

---

[15] Erim (1986) 25-6. There is some indication that the Aphrodisians had pretensions to an antique past when their city was called Ninoe after Ninus, the founder of Nineveh.

[16] Muchow (1988); Sissa (1990) 92.

is a sudden and major interruption, a significant anomaly, in their procession from birth to death. The female protagonists in the Greek novel seem to follow a social code before the novel begins and to pick it up again at the end of the novel. In between the heroines find room to expand their roles: they travel, face all kind of dangers, meet a wide variety of people, and lead as exciting a life during the course of the novel as their life is dull before and after it. Seidel ([1985] 50) points out something similar about Faulkner's *The Unvanquished* (1938) in which he takes the passive belle and places her in a setting of the Civil War: "... women ... reach their fullest potential only during the war; after it, they must again conform to social expectations."

As the inhabitants of Syracuse are portrayed as genteel people, we should not perhaps be surprised to see the novel's two protagonists also so described. The Syracusans represent what Greeks in an uncorrupted world, a world of the good-old-days of the fifth-fourth century B.C. from where comes this myth of Chariton, could have been. Callirhoe like the Southern Belle for the South represents an ideal of the Greek nobility. The Greek novel heroine, like the Southern Belle, becomes the core and subject of a myth because she is different, special, touched by god (often compared to a goddess), hidden from the public, and not at all the usual. Seidel ([1985] 8) remarks that "Her power to delight and fascinate arises from her physical appeal, which contrasts curiously with her personality, which is meek, modest, chaste." The heroines are an irresistible force and hence divine.

Heroines (as well as heroes) of the ancient novels, though very young (in Xenophon of Ephesus they are fourteen and sixteen respectively) receive virtually no help or guidance from their parents.[17] A slave is regularly attendant on the heroine, e.g. Plangon to Callirhoe, who is clever, has grit, and lives so as to land always on her feet. Plangon has no real power because she does not belong to the class of free people: Callirhoe is free, but her freedom helps her not one bit in the real world. The clever slave, however, lives in the real world of survival (no threats of suicide among slaves) and not in the romantic haze of Callirhoe.[18] Plangon is the closest thing Callirhoe gets to an involved mother.

---

[17] Egger (1990) 119ff., 130.

[18] For slave attendants to heroines in Roman literature and their counterparts in American fiction, see Joshel (1986).

The Southern Belle in De Forest's *The Bloody Chasm* (1881),[19] purposely named Virginia, has a servant called 'mammy' who plays the same part as Plangon, an *ersatz* mother. Mammy is full of wisdom beyond her station; since she was never allowed to live in a daydream world, to hope, or to plan for her future happiness, she sees the world as it is and advises Virginia to change her mind and marry a man not of her choosing but of necessity. Seidel ([1985] 22) employs an apt quotation from De Forest's *The Bloody Chasm* to illustrate the practical advice of the slave:[20]

> Womenfolks is like niggers – can't get deir way much in dis yer world; gits along easier ef day can change deir minds.

Callirhoe and Virginia both threaten suicide rather than to marry a foreigner: for Callirhoe a man from Miletus and for Virginia an ex-soldier from the North. While marriage for the two women offers salvation from a grim reality, both view such unwelcome unions as unbecoming expediencies, if not as actual sales of their bodies to save their loved ones. Callirhoe (2.8-2.10) goes through a whole range of emotions before being persuaded by Plangon to marry Dionysius: at first she plans to have an abortion, then to raise the child herself, and finally to yield to Dionysius but to deceive him into believing that the child is his. So too, Virginia, who regards herself as little better than a prostitute is persuaded by her mammy.

In all of these novels there is a clear tension regarding the virginity or chastity of the heroine: will she or will she not be forced into unwanted sex by her captors? This tension helps to provide suspense throughout the novel for the reader, and the release of tension upon consummation with her lover helps to precipitate the ending. For the most part, however, these women encounter exceedingly courteous captors who because of their own passivity or good manners allow them to remain chaste. Anthia protects herself from the advances of a barbarian (4.5) and kills him. Just so Scarlett O'Hara in *Gone with the Wind* kills a renegade northern soldier intent on raping her. Protection of the heroine's virginity or chastity is equated with protection of life itself; rape was tantamount to death, and virginity/chastity

[19] The title of De Forest's novel indicates both the sexual violence committed against the heroine and the bloody war between the North and South. On violence with sexual connotations cf. Achilles Tatius 2.23; 3.15.

[20] De Forest (1881) 96.

to life. Cultural anxiety over virginity, as seen in the Greek novels, is so great that virginity tests are administered to young lovers (Achilles Tatius, Heliodorus).[21]

This concentration on one virtue or quality, to the exclusion of all other virtues, has a serious drawback in character portrayal: the 'good' women, Anthia (Xenophon of Ephesus) and Melanie (*Gone With the Wind*), are uninteresting, and the lustful ones, Melite (Achilles Tatius) and Scarlett O'Hara (*Gone With the Wind*), are captivating and engaging. Williamson ([1986] 30-1) sees a more serious flaw in the concentration on fidelity: "The lovers' supreme virtue, their fidelity, has parallel consequences as regards the possibility of moral choice. The unswerving loyalty to each other, proof against any torture, is devalued by the fact that it is arbitrary: the hero's passion for the heroine is distinguished from that of (usually) innumerable other men only by its arbitrary legitimacy. Since this legitimacy is conferred by the author, albeit in the name of Eros, and not chosen by the protagonists, no real virtue can attach to it. And yet the absolute value placed upon fidelity renders any other virtue impossible: the lovers can and do lie, cheat and manipulate their way out of any situation with only the occasional passing glance at such things as filial piety ... or religious observance ... Love is presented as an automatic and irresistible reaction to beauty ... which is always an optical rather than a spiritual event."

The novel of Longus presents an interesting variation of this motif. Daphnis and Chloe show an open and spontaneous joy of life and love but are technically ill-equipped to consummate the sex act. Their ignorance of sex, which was not a result of repression by society, nevertheless amounts to the same innocence of sex as is found in the other Greek novels. This ignorance, though frustrating, is surely a sign that Daphnis and Chloe belong to the aristocracy: slaves and rough characters know about sex; the nobility of Daphnis and Chloe, unknown to them because they were exposed, shows through in their ignorance/innocence about sex.

The same cultural phenomenon is found in Newman's ([1926] 29) novel *The Hard-Boiled Virgin* in which the Southern Belle Katherine, ignorant of sex, a mark of aristocratic breeding, remarks that "in Georgia no lady was supposed to know she was a virgin until she

[21] Rattenbury (1926) 96.

ceased to be one." Zeitlin ([1990] 424) makes a similar observation about Chloe's knowledge of sex: "Chloe ... does not know what virginity is and, in any case, if she did, would be very happy to lose it to Daphnis."

The real hero and heroine (from the perspective of the novel's form) in the novels of the Southern Belle are the passive, weak, and unambitious aristocrats like Ashley Wilkes and Melanie in *Gone with the Wind,* who initiate no actions. Their passive nature, quiet speech, and surpassingly genteel manners are taken as indications of their aristocratic breeding.[22] We might compare them to the protagonists in the novels of Chariton and Xenophon of Ephesus. The apparent (from the reader's perspective) hero and heroine of *Gone with the Wind* are Rhett Butler and Scarlett O'Hara, aggressive, good businessmen, confident in the use of their sex appeal. This novel thus employs two sets of heroes and heroines because it is a combination of the earlier novel of the Southern Belle (e.g., *Swallow Barn*) and of the newer style (e.g., Faulkner's *Sanctuary*) which war with each other. The comparatively late date (1936) helps to explain the mixed mentality of the southern writer. The second set of protagonists (Butler/O'Hara) stands in many ways opposed to the earlier, as an artistic correction and balance; the earlier protagonists are a part of a myth created to defend and preserve southern values. This earlier southern myth is now balanced by a second myth about the new Southern Belle (O'Hara) who is still beautiful under the magnolias but who is now more practical in business, asserts her rights to have a role in her own life, and confidently manipulates her sexual power to take control when necessary.[23]

---

[22] Scarlett O'Hara feels compelled to create gainful employment for her hero Ashley Wilkes because he is not aggressive enough to find a job; she is surprised when Melanie becomes pregnant, because it means that Ashley has had sex.

[23] It is interesting to remember that the only woman named Belle in *Gone With the Wind* is Belle Watling, a prostitute and friend of Rhett Butler. Young Greeks and Romans are almost encouraged in brief love affairs to keep them from the serious offense of relationships with women of their own station. In the South this same accommodation for men was recognized in the novels of the Southern Belle. Rhett Butler carried on a long relationship with Belle Watling, Atlanta's most famous madam, but for a great number of white Southern men affairs with black slaves were a normal expedient. Seidel (1985) 136 adduces an interesting statistic: "A common pattern was the virtual rape of black women by white men; by 1860, of the four million slaves in the United States, one-eighth were mullattoes. White women were ex-

I would like to suggest that something similar to this combination of new and old heroes and heroines of *Gone with the Wind* can be found also in the novel of Achilles Tatius. This combination might indicate some growth and development of the ancient novel away from the passive hero and heroine, or it might simply illustrate experimentation. It is said of Achilles Tatius that he parodies the earlier novels.[24] While I have no quarrel with that approach, I would add that Achilles Tatius adds depth and richness to his novel by bringing in the second husband-wife pair of Thersander and Melite to complement Clitophon and Leucippe. Melite's attraction to the submissive Clitophon reminds us of Scarlett O'Hara's fascination for the passive Ashley Wilkes.

Melite is a strong and aggressive person who pursues Clitophon until he yields sexually to her. Thersander abducts Leucippe, pummels and humiliates Clitophon, and rides roughshod over government officials standing in his way. I do not see Melite and Thersander as good parodies of Leucippe and Clitophon but rather as examples of the real to be set off against the ideal. If Melite and Thersander represent a development in the ancient novel, later ancient novels (no longer extant or never written) might like Faulkner's *Sanctuary* have given the starring roles to characters like Melite and Thersander and moved Leucippe and Clitophon to minor or supporting parts. Noble protagonists would be replaced by less noble ones, but at the same time passive characters would be replaced by active. In such a case the conventions and codes of the ancient novel would be modified and perhaps even parodied.

When a society as represented in the novels about the Southern Belle or in the Greek novel boasts that its women are the most beautiful in the world and that they compare favorably with Aphrodite or Artemis, there is a concomitant stress on their beauty and a resultant lack of emphasis on accomplishments, personality, intelligence. Such identification of the female protagonists with works of art or objects of art turns the women into objects.[25]

---

pected to tolerate their men's proclivities, since men were popularly thought to be doing their wives a favor by not demeaning them with the sex act."

[24] Durham (1938) 1-19.

[25] Gilbert, Gubar (1979) 12-14.

The Belle as Goddess

In the same way as the Southern Belle becomes the most potent symbol of the South, does Callirhoe stand for Syracuse (read Aphrodisias) or Anthia for Ephesus and Artemis? Callirhoe is more than just another inhabitant of Syracuse: when her marriage to Chaereas is in doubt, the people of Syracuse assemble and discuss it as a civic issue; when she is kidnapped by Theron the people of Syracuse are prepared to dispatch the home fleet. The Southern Belle and female protagonists like Callirhoe and Anthia are all elevated to pedestals for all to see but none to touch. And so, whatever the Belles or leading ladies do is the stuff of myth. In Young's novel *So Red the Rose* ([1934] 65) the Southern Belle bemoans the fact that she is *not* a statue: "If I too were a marble goddess, I could go on forever." Seidel ([1985] 49) calls attention to the fact that this Belle wishes to be "a static object rather than a person." Making an object of the Belle condemns her to a passive role, an ornamentation of her family and her husband. The Southern Belle in Glenn's (1930) *A Short History of Julia* is advised by her brother-in-law to adorn herself in such a way that she always appears to be a picture. Callirhoe is not compared with a goddess as an active force, but always with a statue or representation of a goddess; she does not do the deeds of a goddess, she simply resembles the features of one. Elsom ([1992] 227) offers a feminist reading of Chariton and concludes that "Chariton's romance in particular ... is essentially the display of women as objects and as the carriers of male value."[26]

The Belles of the Greek novel, like the Southern Belles, create a mythology about their beauty and chastity; like the *Widow of Ephesus*[27] they are so famous for both that people come from miles around just to see them. Female protagonists like Charicleia, however, add a desire to remain virgins to their panoply of beauty and chastity in a natural progression toward absolute autonomy over their own bodies or absolute denial of them. Belles like Thecla and Mary in early Christian hagiography carry the idea of virginity to extremes, demanded by the cults which develop after the first generation of

---

[26] Cf. also Hunter (1994) 1073ff.; Egger (1994) 31-48.
[27] Petronius, *Satyrica* 111-12.

Christians, and so provide the perfect material for the burgeoning body of Christian mythology.

This passive, chaste (quasi-virginal) Southern Belle on the pedestal is destroyed, however, by writers like Faulkner (1931) in *Sanctuary* who replace her with a female without inhibition and one prepared to use sexual favors to satisfy animal lust and to gain various advantages. In doing so, however, Faulkner creates the myth of the Southern Slut out of the ashes of the Belle.

In Chariton's novel the Liebespaar marries at the beginning, but in the story Callirhoe spends more time with Dionysius than with Chaereas; in Xenophon of Ephesus Anthia and Habrocomes are separated for most of novel; in Achilles Tatius Leucippe and Clitophon are little more than casual acquaintances; in Heliodorus Charicleia would have preferred Theagenes to be her brother; Longus writes about love.[28] While each heroine has great erotic magnetism to attract men to herself like bears to honey, except for Longus' Chloe and a few scenes in Chariton, Xenophon of Ephesus and Achilles, the leading ladies are strangely almost cold. Charicleia has more in common with Thecla than with Chloe. The code of the aristocratic protagonist or the convention of the heroine of the novel, as Horney ([1967] 126) holds, seems to dictate "that the decent, respectable woman is asexual."[29] As a character in a novel Melite is more nicely rounded and less passive than Leucippe; a little of Arsace's passion for life and love would have made Charicleia less like a suffering nun. Were any novelist to have done this, however, the heroine of the Greek novel would no longer be special, would no longer parallel her mate, and would cease to be a Belle.

Rather than to submit to a pirate Anthia (Xenophon of Ephesus 2.1) contemplates suicide; Callirhoe thinks often of the same action. Rape hits at the very core of being for the heroine: her virginity or her chastity is the essence of her existence. What else is she, if not virginity personified? And if this virginity is destroyed, there is no reason to live; in fact, there is every incentive to suicide. The heroines of Greek novels display the same mythical concern for virtue as

---

[28] Zeitlin (1990) 423.

[29] Williamson (1986) 32: "The view of love articulated by Achilles Tatius and shared by all the [ancient] romance writers makes such a loss of self impossible for their characters: love itself is more like rape than anything else – a violent event which assails them from outside and utterly overpowers them."

mythical creatures like Lucretia in other genres. Seidel ([1985] 148) concludes that the Southern Belle is "expected to react to rape not only with shame and humiliation, but with suicide."

The heroines of the ancient novels are passive in the sense that the novelists do not portray them as individuals who seek control of anything outside themselves or, in fact, who regularly or actively take control even over their own destinies or bodies. These early heroines surrender as passively as do the early Southern Belles. But if we look at women in the ancient novels other than the heroines, we see that some are persons of a different kind. Though Melite is not the heroine of her novel, she is a model for a woman interested in control of, first, her own life (as opposed to her husband's interests) and then second, Clitophon's body (in opposition to her husband's interests). In Heliodorus Arsace, like Melite, takes control, but from previous experience we expect this of the evil, barbarian, 'other' woman. Arsace is similar to Cyno in Xenophon of Ephesus, evil, doomed to failure, and used by the author as an object of contrast with the heroine. Melite on the other hand is a new kind of 'other' woman in the novel; she is not a barbarian, she is probably Greek. Her character combines some elements of the traditionally passive female with some of the aggressive, take-control, evil women. Unlike Arsace and others like her, Melite appreciates her limits (she does not murder her husband to replace him with Clitophon, e.g.) and survives to the end of the story – almost as a new kind of heroine.

Bryan Reardon was kind enough to read this paper in manuscript form. Where I followed his advice, this became a better paper.

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

WILLEM J. AERTS is emeritus professor of Medieval and Modern Greek at the University of Groningen. Publications include *Michaelis Pselli Historia Syntomos*, Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae, Series Berolinensis 30 (Berlin, 1990); 'Panorama der byzantinischen Literatur' in: *Neues Handbuch der Literaturwissenschaft 4, Spätantike*, L.J. Engels - H. Hofmann, edd. (Wiesbaden, 1997), 635-716; with G.A.A. Kortekaas, *Die Apokalypse des Pseudo-Methodius. Die ältesten griechischen und lateinischen Übersetzungen*, 2 vols. Corpus Scriptorum Orientalium 569, 570 = Subsidia 97 and 98 (Louvain, 1998).

KATHRYN CHEW is Lecturer in Classics at Princeton University. She is currently at work on a book exploring the literary and cultural relationship of the stories of the Greek novel heroines and the accounts of the early Christian female martyrs.

FAUSTINA C.W. DOUFIKAR-AERTS is an Arabist. She has taught Classical Arabic and Moroccan Arabic at the University of Utrecht. She has specialized in the Oriental Alexander tradition, in particular in medieval Arabic manuscripts. She has published on 'Al-Iskandar' in classical Arabic literature and in the genre of the late-medieval popular epics. Her dissertation *Alexander Magnus Arabicus* (Leiden, 2003) gives a survey of the rich Alexander tradition in Arabic.

ELLEN FINKELPEARL is Professor of Classics at Scripps College, Claremont, California. Among her publications are: *Metamorphosis of Language in Apuleius* (Michigan, 1998) and, with Carl Schlam (†), 'A Survey of Scholarship on Apuleius 1971-98,' *Lustrum* 42 (2000).

MASSIMO FUSILLO is Professor of Literary Theory in the Dipartimento di Culture Comparate at the University of L'Aquila. He has published on Hellenistic poetry, ancient narrative, Greek theatre and its modern performance, and modern reception of classical literature. His publications include *Il tempo delle Argonautiche: Un'analisi del racconto in Apollonio Rodio* (Rome, 1985); *Il romanzo greco: Poli-*

fonia ed eros (Venice, 1989; as *Naissance du roman*, Paris, 1991), and *La Grecia secondo Pasolini: Mito e cinema* (Florence, 1996).

LUCA GRAVERINI is assistant professor of Latin literature at the University of Siena - Arezzo (Italy). He has published several papers on Apuleius, focusing especially on the intertextual relations which link the *Metamorphoses* to the epic and historiographical tradition.

JUDITH P. HALLETT is Professor and Chair of Classics at the University of Maryland, College Park. She has published widely on Latin language and literature, women in Roman society and ancient sexuality. This is her first publication on the ancient novel.

WILLIAM HANSEN is Professor of Classical Studies and Folklore at Indiana University, Bloomington. His publications deal mostly with ancient folklore, mythology, and popular literature. Recent books include *Anthology of Ancient Greek Popular Literature* (Indiana, 1998) and *Ariadne's Thread: A Guide to International Tales Found in Classical Literature* (Cornell, 2002).

RUTH E. HARDER teaches at the University of Zurich. She has published on Greek drama and on the ancient and Byzantine novel.

STEPHEN HARRISON is Fellow and Tutor in Classics at Corpus Christi College, Oxford and Reader in Classical Languages and Literature at the University of Oxford. He is author of *Apuleius: A Latin Sophist* (Oxford, 2000) and editor of *Oxford readings in the Roman Novel* (Oxford, 1999), and of *Apuleius: Rhetorical Works* (Oxford, 2001).

NIKLAS HOLZBERG is Professor of Classics at the University of Munich. He has published extensively on ancient fiction, Roman love poetry, and the Aesop tradition. His most recent books are *Der antike Roman* (Düsseldorf, 2001), *Catull* (Munich, 2002), *Martial und das antike Epigramm* (Darmstadt, 2002), *Ovid: The Poet and His Work* (Ithaca, N. Y., 2002), *The Ancient Fable* (Indianapolis, 2002).

WYTSE H. KEULEN has published several articles on Apuleius; his dissertation, *Apuleius Madaurensis. Metamorphoses*, Book I, 1-20 (Groningen, 2003) will appear as a commentary on the whole of

Book One of Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* in the series *Groningen Commentaries on Apuleius*.

ANDREW LAIRD is Reader in Greek and Latin Literature at the University of Warwick. His publications include *Powers of Expression, Expressions of Power* (Oxford, 1999) and he is co-editor, with Ahuvia Kahane, of *A Companion to the Prologue of Apuleius'* Metamorphoses (Oxford, 2001).

DONALD LATEINER is the John Wright Professor of Classics at Ohio Wesleyan University. He studies Herodotus (*The Historical Method of Herodotus*, 1989), Homer (*Sardonic Smile. Nonverbal Behavior in Homeric Epic*, 1995), and the ancient novels.

FRANÇOISE LÉTOUBLON is professor of Greek at the University of Grenoble. Her publications include *Il allait pareil à la nuit* (Paris, 1985), *Fonder une cité* (Grenoble, 1987), and *Les lieux communs du roman. Stéréotypes grecs d'aventure et d'amour* (Leiden: Brill, 1993).

DANIELLE VAN MAL - MAEDER is Assistant Professor at the University of Lausanne. Her publications include a commentary on the second book of Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* in the series of the Groningen Commentaries on Apuleius (Groningen, *GCA* 2001), and a forthcoming monograph on Latin declamation (*La Fiction des Déclamations*).

MARKO MARINČIČ is Lecturer of Classics at the University of Ljubljana. He has published on Vergil, Hellenistic poetry, and on the ancient novel.

JOHN R. MORGAN is Senior Lecturer in Classics at the University of Wales Swansea, and one of the select few to have given a paper at all three ICAN conferences. He is the author of many articles on the Greek novels, and translated Heliodorus for B.P. Reardon's *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*. His commentary on *Daphnis and Chloe* is due to be published in 2003.

INGELA NILSSON has a Ph.D. from Göteborg University, where she has been working in the Department of Classics. She is currently re-

search fellow at the Byzantinisch-Neugriechisches Seminar, Freie Universität Berlin.

STEPHEN NIMIS is Professor of Classics at Miami University of Ohio. He has published several contributions on the ancient novel including a series of articles in *Arethusa*.

STELIOS PANAYOTAKIS is Marie Curie Research Fellow at the Department of Classics, University of Groningen. He has published on Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*, and on the *Historia Apollonii regis Tyri*. His commentary on the *Historia Apollonii regis Tyri* (rec. A) is forthcoming. He is currently working on family relationships in the ancient novel.

GARETH SCHMELING is Distinguished Professor of Classics at the University of Florida at Gainesville. He has published extensively on the ancient novel: apart from numerous articles, his publications include monographs on Chariton (Boston, Twayne Publishers, 1974) and Xenophon of Ephesus (Boston, Twayne Publishers, 1980), a *Bibliography on Petronius* (Leiden: Brill, 1977); he made a critical edition of the *Historia Apolonii regis Tyri* (Leipzig, 1988) and is the editor of *The Novel in the Ancient World* (Leiden: Brill, 1996; 2003 paperback edition) and of the *Petronian Society Newsletter* (from 1970 onward), and co-editor of *Ancient Narrative*.

ERKKI SIRONEN is Lecturer in Ancient Greek Language and Literature at the University of Helsinki, Finland. He has published mostly on Late Antique Epigraphy, especially Attic inscriptions.

NIALL W. SLATER is Professor of Classics at Emory University. His work on the novel and ancient comedy includes *Reading Petronius* (Johns Hopkins, 1990) and *Spectator Politics: Metatheatre and Performance in Aristophanes* (University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002).

RICHARD STONEMAN is Publisher for Classics and Archaeology at Routledge. He is the author of a number of studies of the Alexander romance, including a three volume edition and commentary on the Greek and Latin versions, forthcoming from Mondadori in the series *Scrittori greci e latini*; and of the Penguin translation of the *Alexander Romance* (1991).

TIM WHITMARSH is Lecturer in Hellenistic Literature at the University of Exeter. He has published widely on the literature of Roman Greece, including *Greek literature and the Roman empire: the politics of imitation* (Oxford, 2001). He is currently working on a project called *Identifications: reading the self in the ancient Greek novel*.

GIUSEPPE ZANETTO is Professor of Greek Literature at the Università degli Studi of Milan. He edited the *Epistulae* of Theophylactus and the *Rhesus* of [Euripides] for the Bibliotheca Teubneriana, and the *Aves* of Aristophanes for the Collection Lorenzo Valla; he is co-author of the *Lessico dei Romanzieri Greci*.

FROMA ZEITLIN is Charles Ewing Professor of Greek Language and Literature and Professor of Comparative Literature at Princeton University. She has published extensively on Greek literature, from epic through drama to the novel.

MAAIKE ZIMMERMAN is Lecturer in Latin Language and Literature in the Department of Classics at the University of Groningen. She is the leader of the Research group *Groningen Commentaries on Apuleius*; her publications include a commentary on Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* Book Ten (*GCA* 2000). She is the editor-in-chief of *Ancient Narrative*.

This page intentionally left blank

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbreviations

Abbreviations for periodicals are those of *L'Année Philologique*.

AAGA	*Aspects of Apuleius' Golden Ass. A Collection of Original Papers*, edd. B.L. Hijmans Jr., R.Th. Van der Paardt (Groningen, 1978).
AAGA 2	*Aspects of Apuleius' Golden Ass. Volume II: Cupid and Psyche*, ed. M. Zimmerman et al. (Groningen, 1998).
AASS	*Acta Sanctorum*. Also available: Société des Bollandistes, the full text database online, ed. Chadwyck-Healey Ltd. (Cambridge, 1999-2002): http://acta.chadwyck.com
AN	*Ancient Narrative*, edd. M. Zimmerman, G. Schmeling, S.J. Harrison, H. Hofmann. Printed volumes: Groningen, 2002-. Electronic journal: www.ancientnarrative.com
ANRW	*Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, edd. H. Temporini, W. Haase (Berlin, 1972-).
BHL	*Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina*.
CAGN	*Collected Ancient Greek Novels*, ed. B.P. Reardon (Berkeley/Los Angeles/London, 1989).
CEG	*Carmina Epigraphica Graeca*, ed. P.A. Hansen, vol. 1: *saeculorum VIII-V a.Chr.n.* (Berlin/New York, 1983); vol. 2: *saeculi IV a.Chr.n.* (Berlin/New York, 1989).
EI^2	*Encyclopedia of Islam*, second edition.
GCA	*Groningen Commentaries on Apuleius* (see below: Hijmans et al.; Zimmerman [et al.]; Van Mal-Maeder).
GCN	*Groningen Colloquia on the Novel*, ed. H. Hofmann, vol. 1-6 (Groningen, 1988-1995); edd. H. Hofmann, M. Zimmerman, vol. 7-9 (Groningen, 1996-1998).
ILS	*Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae*, ed. H. Dessau (Berlin, 1892-1916).
OLD	*Oxford Latin Dictionary* (Oxford, 1968-1982).
PSN	*Petronian Society Newsletter*, ed. G. Schmeling (1970-). Since 2001 published online as a part of *Ancient Narrative*: http://www.ancientnarrative.com/PSN
RAC	*Reallexicon für Antike und Christentum* (Stuttgart, 1950-).
RE	*Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* (Stuttgart, 1894-).
ThLL	*Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* (Leipzig/Stuttgart, 1900-).

General Bibliography

Abbott N., *Studies in Arabic Literary Papyri I: historical texts*. Oriental Institute Publications, 75 (Chicago, 1957), 50-5.

Abele W., *Die antiken Quellen des Hans Sachs*. Beilage zum Programm der Realanstalt in Cannstatt. 2 vols. (Cannstatt, 1897-9).

Adler A. (ed.), *Suidae Lexicon* (Leipzig, 1928-38).

Adrados F., Reverdin O. (edd.), *La fable*. Entretiens Hardt, 30 (Vandœuvres/Genève, 1984).

Aerts W.J., 'The 'first' book (Z 1 Trapp) of the epic Digenis Akritas', in N.M. Panayotakis (1993), vol. II, 19-25.

——, 'Panorama der byzantinischen Literatur', in *Neues Handbuch der Literaturwissenschaft 4*, edd. L.J. Engels, H. Hofmann (Wiesbaden, 1997). [= Aerts (1997a)]

——, 'Das literarische Porträt in der byzantinischen Literatur', in *GCN* 8 (1997), 151-95. [= Aerts (1997b)]

Aerts W.J., Hermans J.M.M., Visser E. (edd.), *Alexander the Great in the Middle Ages. Ten Studies on the Last Days of Alexander in Literary and Historical Writing* (Nijmegen, 1978).

Aerts W.J., Kortekaas G.A.A. (edd.), *Die Apokalypse des Pseudo-Methodios: die ältesten griechischen und lateinischen Rezensionen* (Louvain, 1998).

Afinogenov D., 'The Bride-Show of Theophilos: Some Notes on the Sources', *Eranos* 95 (1997), 10-18.

Agapitos P.A., 'Michael Italikos, Klage auf den Tod seines Rebhuhns', *ByzZ* 82 (1989), 59-68.

——, ''Η χρονολογικὴ ἀκολουθία Καλλιμάχου, Βελθάνδρου, Λιβίστρου', in N.M. Panayotakis (1993), vol. II, 97-134.

——, 'Narrative, rhetoric, and 'drama' rediscovered: scholars and poets in Byzantium interpret Heliodorus', in Hunter (1998), 125-56. [= Agapitos (1998a)]

——, 'Mischung der Gattungen und Überschreitung der Gesetze: Die Grabrede des Eustathios von Thessalonike auf Nikolaos Hagiotheodorites', *JŒByz* 48 (1998), 119-46. [= Agapitos (1998b)]

Ahlwardt W., *Verzeignis der Arabischen Handschriften der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin 8* (Berlin, 1896).

Alaux J., Létoublon F., 'ΑΘΛΟΘΕΤΟΥΣΑ ΤΥΧΗ. Les vicissitudes des choses humaines dans le roman grec: l'exemple des *Ethiopiques*', in *Cahiers du GITA* 11, *La Tradition créatrice du théâtre antique,* I. En Grèce ancienne (Montpellier, 1998), 145-70.

Alexander P.J., 'Psevdo-Mefodiy in Efiopiya', *Antichnaya Drevnost' I Srednie Veka.* Sbornik 10 (Sverdlovsk, 1973); reprinted in *Religious and Political Thought in Byzantium* (London, 1978) x1 21-27a (English summary at 2a).

——, *The Byzantine Apocalyptic Tradition* (Berkeley, 1985).

Almqvist H., *Plutarch und das Neue Testament* (Uppsala, 1946).

Aloni A., *Lirici greci. Poeti giambici* (Milano, 1993).

Amat J., *Passion de Perpétue et de Félicité suivi des Actes. Introduction, texte critique, traduction, commentaire et index* (Paris, 1996).

Ancona R., 'The Subterfuge of Reason: Horace, *Odes* 1.23 and the Construction of Male Desire', *Helios* 16.1 (1989), 25-47.

——, *Time and the Erotic in Horace's Odes* (Durham/London, 1994).

Anderson A.R., 'Alexander at the Caspian gates', *TAPA* 59 (1928), 130-63.

——, *Alexander's Gate, Gog and Magog, and the Inclosed Nations* (Cambridge, Mass., 1932).
Anderson G., *Lucian's Comic Fiction* (Leiden, 1976).
——, *Ancient Fiction. The Novel in the Graeco-Roman World* (London, 1984).
——, 'The *pepaideumenos* in Action: Sophists and their Outlook in the Early Empire', in *ANRW* II.33.1 (1989), 79-208.
——, 'The Second Sophistic: Some Problems of Perspective', in Russell (1990), 91-110.
——, *The Second Sophistic. A Cultural Phenomenon in the Roman Empire* (London/New York, 1993).
Anderson W., 'Zu Apuleius' Novelle vom Tode der Charite', *Philologus* 68 (1909), 537-49.
Anderson W.S. (ed.), *P. Ovidii Nasonis Metamorphoses* (Stuttgart/Leipzig, 1977).
Andreassi M., 'Esopo sulla scena: Il mimo della *Moicheutria* e la *Vita Aesopi*', *RhM* 144 (2001), 203-25.
Angelet C., 'Le topos du manuscrit trouvé: considérations historiques et typologiques', in Herman, Hallyn (1999), xxxi-liv.
Anonymous, 'Napoleon's Book of Fate', in *The Complete Book of Fortune: How to Reveal the Secrets of the Past, the Present and the Future* (London, 1994), 250-68.
Archibald E., *Apollonius of Tyre. Medieval and Renaissance Themes and Variations* (Cambridge, 1991).
Arjava A., *Women and Law in Late Antiquity* (Oxford, 1996).
Arrowsmith W., 'Luxury and Death in the *Satyricon*', *Arion* 5.3 (1966), 305-31.
Ascough R., 'Narrative Technique and Generic Designation: Crowd Scenes in Luke-Acts and in Chariton', *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 58 (1996), 69-81.
Ashtiany J. (et al., edd.), *Abbasid Belles-Lettres* (Cambridge, 1990).
Augar F., *Die Frau im römischen Christenprocess. Ein Beitrag zur Verfolgungsgeschichte der christlichen Kirche im römischen Staat* (Leipzig, 1905).
Auger D., 'Rêve, image et récit dans le roman de Chariton', *Ktèma* 8 (1983), 39-52.
Aymard J., 'Vénus et les impératrices sous les derniers Antonins', *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire* 51 (1934), 178-96.
Bacon H., 'The Sibyl in the Bottle', *Virginia Quarterly* 34 (1958), 262-76.
Badawi A. (ed.), *Abu al-afa' al-Mubassir b. Fatik… Los bocados de oro* (Madrid, 1958).
—— (ed.), *Hunayn ibn Ishâq, Âdâb al-Falâsifa* (Kuwayt, 1985).
Baker L., *The Percys of Mississippi* (Baton Rouge, 1983).
Bakhtin M., *The Dialogic Imagination,* ed. M. Holquist (Austin, 1981, russ. original 1934-5).
Bal M., *Narratology: introduction to the theory of narrative* (Toronto, ²1997).
Bandini M., 'Il modello della metamorfosi ovidiana nel romanzo di Apuleio', *Maia* 38 (1986), 33-9.
Barber E.A. (ed.), *Sexti Properti Carmina* (Oxford, 1960).
Barchiesi A., 'Poeti epici e narratori', in *Metamorfosi (Sulmona, 20-22 Novembre 1994),* a c. di G. Papponetti (Sulmona, 1997), 121-41.
Barnes J., *The Presocratic Philosophers, Volume 2: Empedocles to Democritus* (London, 1979).
Barrett C., 'The marriages of Charite and Psyche', *CB* 70 (1994), 73-88.
Barthes J., 'The Reality Effect', in idem, *The Rustle of Language.* Translated by Richard Howard (New York, 1986), 141-8.

Barton C.A., 'The Roman Blush: The Delicate Matter of Self-Control', in *Constructions of the Classical Body*, ed. J.I. Porter (Ann Arbor, 1999), 212-34.
Bartsch S., *Decoding the Ancient Novel* (Princeton, 1989).
——, *Actors in the Audience* (Cambridge, Mass., 1994).
Bashear S., 'Apocalyptic and other materials on early Muslim-Byzantine Wars: a review of Arabic sources', *JRAS* ser.3.1 (1991), 173-207.
Bastianini G., Sedley D., 'Commentarium in Platonis "Theaetetum"', in *Corpus dei papiri filosofici greci e latini,* Volume 3: *Commentarii* (Florence, 1995), 227-562.
Bauman R.A., *Crime and Punishment in Ancient Rome* (London/New York, 1996).
Baumbach M., 'Die Meroe-Episode in Heliodors *Aithiopika*', *RhM* 140 (1997), 333-41.
Beaton R., *The Medieval Greek Romance* (London/New York, [2]1996).
Bechtle G., 'The Adultery-Tales in the Ninth Book of Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*', *Hermes* 123 (1995), 106-16.
Beck H.-G., *Geschichte der byzantinischen Volksliteratur*. Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft XII, 2, 3 (München, 1971).
Beeston A.F.L., Johnstone T.M., Serjeant R.B., Smith G.R. (edd.), *The Cambridge History of Arabic Literature: Arabic Literature to the end of the 'Umayyad Period* (Cambridge,1983).
Benedetti C., *Pasolini contro Calvino. Per una letteratura impura* (Torino, 1998).
Berger G. (ed.), *Pour et contre le roman. Anthologie du discours théorique sur la fiction narrative en prose du XVIIe siècle* (Paris/Seattle/Tübingen, 1996).
——, *Annäherungen an die Insel. Lektüren von Umberto Ecos »Die Insel des vorigen Tages«* (Bielefeld, 1999).
Bergstraesser G., *Hunain ibn Ishaq und seine Schule* (Leiden, 1913).
Beschorner A., Holzberg N., 'A Bibliography of the Aesop Romance', in Holzberg (ed.) (1992), 165-87.
Bessière J. (ed.), *Commencements du roman* (Paris, 2001).
Bettini M., *The Portrait of the Lover* (Berkeley, 1999).
Beye C., *Epic and Romance in the Argonautica of Apollonius* (Carbondale, 1982).
Bieber M., *History of the Greek and Roman Theatre* (Princeton, 1961).
Bielawski J., Plezia M., *Lettre d'Aristote à Alexandre sur la politique envers les cités* (Wroclaw, 1970).
Billault A., *La création romanesque dans la littérature grecque* (Paris, 1991).
Biraud M., 'L'hypotexte homérique et les rôles amoureux de Callirhoé dans le roman de Chariton', in *Actes du Centre de Recherches: Sémiologie de l'amour dans les civilisations méditerranéennes*', Vol.1 (Paris, 1986), 21-7.
Björk C., '*Onar idein*. De la perception de rêve chez les anciens', *Eranos* 44 (1946), 306-15.
Boissonade J.F. (ed.), *Nicetae Eugeniani narrationem amatoriam et Constantini Manassis fragmenta*, Band 2 (Paris, 1819).
——, 'Ψελλοῦ, Περὶ χαρακτήρων συγγραμμάτων τινων' in *Michael Psellus, De operatione daemonum*, ed. J.F. Boissonade (Nürnberg, 1838, repr. Amsterdam, 1964), 48-52.
Bojadziev D., 'Stéréotype socio-culturel et réalité linguistique: parallèles pétroniens des inscriptions des pays thraces', *Linguistique Balkanique* 37 (1994-5), 19-36; 211-22.
Bompaire J., *Lucien écrivain: imitation et création* (Paris, 1958).
Bonanno M.G., 'Nomi e soprannomi archilochei', *MH* 37 (1980), 65-88.

Bonner S.F., *Roman Declamation in the Late Republic and Early Empire* (Liverpool, 1949).
Booth W., *The rhetoric of fiction* (London, ²1983).
Bornecque H., *Les déclamations et les déclamateurs d'après Sénèque le père* (Lille, 1902).
——, *Sénèque le rhéteur. Controverses et suasoires* (Paris, 1932).
Boulnois L., *The Silk Road* (London, 1966).
Bowersock G. W., *Martyrdom and Rome* (Cambridge, 1995).
Bowie E.L., 'The Novel in the Real World', in Reardon (1977), 91-6.
——, 'Theocritus' Seventh Idyll, Philetas and Longus', *CQ* 35 (1985), 67-91.
——, 'The Greek Novel', in *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*, edd. P.E. Easterling, E.J. Kenney, Vol. 1 part 4: The Hellenistic Period and the Empire (Cambridge, 1989), 123-39.
——, 'The Readership of Greek Novels in the Ancient World', in Tatum (1994), 435-59.
——, 'The Ancient Readers of the Greek Novel', in Schmeling (ed.) (1996), 87-106.
Bradley K., 'Animalizing the Slave: The Truth of Fiction', *JRS* 90 (2000), 110-25.
Branham R. Bracht, 'Inventing the Novel', in *Bakhtin in Contexts: Across the Disciplines*, ed. A. Mandelker (Evanston, 1995), 79-87.
——, 'Representing Time in Ancient Fiction', *AN* 1 (Groningen, 2002), 1-31.
Braund S., 'Juvenal – misogynist or misogamist?', *JRS* 82 (1992), 71-86.
Bremmer J.N., 'Aspects of the *Acts of Peter*: Women, Magic, Place and Date', in *The Apocryphal Acts of Peter*, ed. J.N. Bremmer (Leuven, 1998), 1-20.
——, 'Man, Magic, and Martyrdom in the *Acts of Andrew*', in *The Apocryphal Acts of Andrew*, ed. J.N. Bremmer (Leuven, 2000), 15-34.
——, 'The *Acts of Thomas*: Place, Date and Women', in *The Apocryphal Acts of Thomas*, ed. J.N. Bremmer (Leuven, 2001), 74-90.
——, 'Perpetua and Her Diary: Authenticity, Family and Visions', in *Märtyrer und Märtyrerakten*, ed. W. Ameling (Stuttgart, 2002), 77-120.
——, 'The Vision of Saturus in the *Passio Perpetuae*' (forthcoming in a volume of collected essays) (Leiden, 2003).
Bridges M., Bürgel J.C., *The Problematics of Power: eastern and western representations of Alexander the Great* (Bern, 1996).
Brillante C., 'Metamorfosi di un'immagine: le statue animate e il sogno', in *Il sogno in Grecia*, ed. G. Guidorizzi (Rome/Bari, 1988), 17-33.
Brock S., 'The Laments of the Philosophers over Alexander in Syriac', *JSS* 15 (1970), 205-18.
——, 'From Antagonism to Assimilation: Syriac Attitudes to Greek Learning', in *East of Byzantium: Syria and Armenia in the Formative period*, edd. N. Garsoian, T. Mathews, R. Thomson (Washington DC, 1982), 17-34; repr. in *Syriac Perspectives on Late Antiquity*, ed. S. Brock (London, 1984), ch.5.
——, 'The Syriac Background to Hunayn's translation techniques', *ARAM* 3 (1991), 139-62.
Brock S., Harvey S.A., *Holy Women of the Syrian Orient* (Berkeley, 1987).
Brocker M., *Aristoteles als Alexanders Lehrer in der Legende* (Diss. Bonn, 1966).
Brooks P., *Reading for the Plot* (Cambridge, Mass., 1984).
Brotherton B., *The Vocabulary of Intrigue in Roman Comedy* (Chicago, 1926; repr. New York/London, 1978).
Brown P. L., *Body and Society. Men, Women, and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity* (New York, 1988).

——, ‘Bodies and Minds: Sexuality and Renunciation in Early Christianity’, in Halperin, Winkler, Zeitlin (1990), 479-93.

Browne E.G., ‘Some account of the Arabic work entitled ‘Nihayatu’l-irah fi akhbari’l-Furs wa’l-Arab’, particularly of that part which treats of the Persian kings’, *JRAS* 32 (1900), 195-259.

Brunner H., Hirschmann G., Schnelbögl F. (edd.), *Hans Sachs und Nürnberg: Bedingungen und Probleme reichsstädtischer Literatur. Hans Sachs zum 400. T odestag am 19. Januar 1976*. Nürnberger Forschungen, 19 (Nürnberg, 1976).

Brunner H., ‘Hans Sachs – Über die Schwierigkeiten literarischen Schaffens in der Reichsstadt Nürnberg’, in Brunner, Hirschmann, Schnelbögl (1976), 1-13.

Brunner H., Wachinger B., *Repertorium der Sangsprüche und Meisterlieder des 12. bis 18. Jahrhunderts*, vol. 9-11: Hans Sachs 1-6278 (Tübingen, 1986-7).

Buchheim Th., *Gorgias von Leontinoi. Reden, Fragmente und Testimonien*. Philosophische Bibliothek, 404 (Hamburg, 1989).

Buchwald W., Hohlweg A., Prinz O., *Tusculum Lexikon griechischer und lateinischer Autoren* (Darmstadt, ^{3}1982).

Buehler C. F. (ed.), *The Dicts and Sayings of the Philosophers* (London, 1941).

Bürgel J.C., *Nizami. Das Alexanderbuch Iskendername*, transl. from Persian (Zürich, 1991).

Bulgakov P., ‘The Arabic parallel to the 2nd chapter of the 3rd book of the Syriac Romance of Alexander’, *Palestinskij Sbornik* 2 (64/65; 1965), 53-7 (in Russian).

Burkert W., ‘Hellenistische Pseudopythagorica’, *Philologus* 105 (1961), 16-43; 226-46.

Burnett C.F., ‘Arabic Greek and Latin Works on Astrological Magic attributed to Aristotle’, in *Pseudo-Aristotle in the Middle Ages*. Warburg Surveys 11, edd. J. Kraye, W.F. Ryan and C.B. Schmitt (London, 1986), 84-96.

Burnyeat M., ‘The Material and Sources of Plato’s Dream’, *Phronesis* 15 (1970), 101-22.

—— (ed.), *The Theaetetus of Plato* (Indianapolis, 1990).

Burton Sir R., *The Book of A Thousand Nights and One Night* (New York, 1934).

Butler J., *Bodies That Matter. On the Discursive Limits of ‘Sex’* (New York, 1993).

Buzurg ibn Shahriyar, *The Book of the Marvels of India*. Translated from the French of Marcel Devic by P. Quennel (London, 1928); also *The Book of Wonders of India*, transl. G.S.P. Freeman-Grenville (London, 1981).

Cairns F., *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry* (Edinburgh, 1972).

Calas F., *Le roman épistolaire* (Paris, 1996).

Cameron A., Conrad L. (edd.), *The Byzantine and Early Islamic Near East: I: Problems in the Literary Source Material* (Princeton, 1992).

Cameron A., *The Greek Anthology from Meleager to Planudes* (Oxford, 1993).

Cantarella E., *I supplizi capitali in Grecia e a Roma* (Milano, 1991).

Carpenter H., *Dennis Potter* (London, 1998).

Cary G., *The Medieval Alexander*, ed. D.J.A. Ross (Cambridge, repr.1967).

Cash W., *The Mind of the South* (New York, 1941).

Castelli E.A., *Visions and Voyeurism: Holy Women and the Politics of Sight in Early Christianity*. Protocol of the Colloquy of the Center for Hermeneutical Studies, 6 December 1992, new series 2 (Berkeley, 1995).

Castiglioni L., ‘Osservazioni critiche a Longo Sofista, Senofonte Efesio e Caritone I: per un’ edizione di Longo’, *Rivista di filologia* 34 (1906), 293-316.

Cataudella Q., *Luciano: Storia vera: introduzione, traduzione e note* (Milano, 1990).

Cavallo G., ‘Veicoli materiali della letteratura di consumo. Maniere di scrivere e maniere di leggere’, in Pecere, Stramaglia (1996), 13-46.
Chalk H.H.O., ‘Eros and the Lesbian Pastorals of Longus’, *JHS* 80 (1960), 32-51; reprinted in Gärtner (1984), 388-407.
Charles R.H., ‘Ahiqar’, in *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* (Oxford, 1913, repr. 1963), II, 715-84.
Charlesworth M., ‘The Refusal of Divine Honours, an Augustan Formula’, *Papers of the British School at Rome* 15 (1939), 1-10.
Cheikho L. (ed.), Eutychius (Saʿîd ibn al-Bitrîq), ‘Kitâb at-Târîkh. Eutychii Patriarchae Alexandrini Annales’, *CSCO* 50 (Beirut, 1906).
Chew K., ‘Achilles Tatius and Parody’, *CJ* 96 (2000), 57-70.
Ciaffi V., *Petronio in Apuleio* (Torino, 1960).
Ciancaglini C.A., ‘Gli antecedenti del *Romanzo* siriaco di Alessandro’, in Finazzi, Valvo (1998), 55-94.
Clark E. A., *The Life of Melania the Younger. Introduction, Translation, Commentary*. Studies in Women and Religion vol. 14 (New York, 1984).
Clark G., ‘Bodies and Blood. Late Antique debate on martyrdom, virginity and resurrection’, in *Changing Bodies, Changing Meanings. Studies on the human body in antiquity*, ed. D. Montserrat (London/New York, 1998), 99-115.
Clarke J., *Looking at Lovemaking* (Berkeley, 1998).
Clausen W., ‘Callimachus and Latin Poetry’, *GRBS* 5 (1964), 181-96.
Clay D., ‘Plato’s First Words’, in Dunn, Cole (1992), 113-30.
Coleman K.M., ‘Fatal Charades: Roman Executions Staged as Mythological Enactments’, *JRS* 80 (1990), 44-73.
Colin J., ‘Apulée en Thessalie: fiction ou vérité ?’, *Latomus* 24 (1965), 330-45.
Conca F., ‘Scribi e lettori dei Romanzi tardo antichi e bizantini’, in *Atti del primo convegno di Studi Tardoantichi: ‘Metodologie della ricerca sulla Tarda Antichità’* (Napoli, 1989), 223-46.
Conca F. (ed.), *Nicetas Eugenianus, De Drosillae et Chariclis amoribus* (Amsterdam, 1990).
—— (ed.), *Il romanzo bizantino del XII secolo. Teodoro Prodromo, Niceta Eugeniano, Eustazio Macrembolita, Constantino Manasse* (Torino, 1994).
Conte G.B., ‘Proems in the Middle’, *YCS* 29 (1992), 147-59.
——, *Genres and Readers* (Baltimore/London, 1994).
——, *The Hidden Author: An Interpretation of Petronius’ Satyricon*. Translated by E. Fantham (Berkeley/Los Angeles/London, 1996).
——, *L’autore nascosto. Un’interpretazione del ‘Satyricon’* (Bologna, 1997).
Conybeare F.C., Rendel Harris J., Smith Lewis A. (ed./transl.), *The story of Ahikar. From the Aramaic, Syriac, Arabic, Armenian, Ethiopic, Old Turkish, Greek and Slavonic Versions* (London, ^{2}1913).
Cook M., *Muhammad* (Oxford, 1983).
Coon L., *Sacred Fictions: Holy Women and Hagiography in Late Antiquity* (Philadelphia, 1997).
Cooper K., *The Virgin and the Bride. Idealized Womanhood in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge, Mass., 1996).
——, ‘The martyr, the *matrona* and the bishop: the matron Lucina and the politics of martyr cult in fifth- and sixth-century Rome’, *Early Medieval Europe* 8 (1999), 297-317.
Coulet H., *Le Roman jusqu’à la Révolution* (Paris, 1968).
Crapanzano V., *Hermes’ Dilemma and Hamlet’s Desire: On the Epistemology of Interpretation* (Harvard, 1992).

Criscuolo U. (ed.), *Michele Psello, Autobiografia. Encomio per la madre* (Napoli, 1989).
Cunningham I.C. (ed.), *Herodas Mimiambi. Cum appendice fragmentorum mimorum papyraceorum* (Leipzig, 1987).
Cupane C., 'lI motivo del castello nella narrativa tardo-byzantina', *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 27 (1978), 229-67.
—— (ed.), *Romanzi Cavallereschi Bizantini* (Torino, 1995).
Curtius E.R., *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages* (London, 1953).
Czegledy K., 'The Syriac legend concerning Alexander the Great', *Acta Orientalia* 7 (Budapest, 1957), 231-49.
Dällenbach L., *The Mirror in the Text* (Oxford, 1989).
Dalley S. (transl.), *Myths from Mesopotamia: Creation, The Flood, Gilgamesh, and others* (Oxford/New York, 1989).
——, 'Gilgamesh in the Arabian Nights', *JRAS* ser.3.1 (1991), 1-30.
Dalmeyda G. (éd. et trad.), *Longus Pastorales* (Paris, 1934).
—— (éd. et trad.), *Xénophon d'Ephèse, Les Ephésiaques ou Habrocomès et Anthia* (Paris, [2]1962).
Davies G., 'The Significance of the Handshake motif in Classical funerary art', *AJA* 89.4 (1985), 627-40.
Davies M., 'Homer and the Fable: Odyssey 21.293-306', *Prometheus* 27 (2001), 193-210.
De Filippo J.G, '*Curiositas* and the Platonism of Apuleius' *Golden Ass*', *AJPh* 111 (1990), 471-92. [reprinted in Harrison (1999), 269-89]
De Forest J.W., *The Bloody Chasm* (New York, 1881).
De Scudéry M., *Clélie. Histoire romaine* (1654) (Genf, 1973) (Nachdr. d. Ausg. Paris, 1660).
Degani E., Burzacchini G. (edd.), *Lirici greci* (Firenze, 1977).
Degani E., *Studi su Ipponatte* (Bari, 1984).
——, 'Aristofane e la tradizione dell'invettiva personale in Grecia', in *Aristophane*. Entretiens Hardt, 38, edd. J.M. Bremer, E.W. Handley (Vandœuvres/Genève, 1993), 1-49.
Dehandschutter B., 'The *Martyrium Polycarpi*: A Century of Research', *ANRW* II 27.1 (1993), 485-522.
Delehaye H., *Étude sur le Légendier Romain. Les Saints de Novembre et de Décembre* (Bruxelles, 1936).
Delhay C., 'Achilles Tatius fabuliste?', *Pallas* 31 (1990), 117-31.
Den Boeft J., Bremmer J., 'Notiunculae Martyrologicae', *VChr* 35 (1981), 43-56.
——, 'Notiunculae Martyrologicae II', *VChr* 36 (1982), 383-402.
——, 'Notiunculae Martyrologicae IV', *VChr* 45 (1991), 105-22.
Denomy A.J., *The Old French Lives of Saint Agnes* (Cambridge, Mass., 1938).
Deroux C. (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History VI*. Collection Latomus, 217 (Bruxelles, 1992).
Derrida J., *De la grammatologie* (Paris, 1967).
——, *Dissémination* (Paris, 1972).
Deselaers P., *Das Buch Tobit: Studien zu seiner Entstehung, Komposition und Theologie* (Göttingen, 1982).
Desjardins R., 'The Horns of Dilemma: Dreaming and Waking Vision in the *Theaetetus*', *Ancient Philosophy* 1 (1980-81), 109-26.
Dicke G., *Heinrich Steinhöwels 'Esopus' und seine Fortsetzer: Untersuchungen zu einem Bucherfolg der Frühdruckzeit*. Münchener Texte und Untersuchungen zur deutschen Literatur des Mittelalters, 103 (München, 1994).

Dickie M.W., *Magic and Magicians in the Greco-Roman World* (London/New York 2001).
Dillery J., 'Aesop, Isis, and the Heliconian Muses', *CPh* 94 (1999), 268-80.
Dingwall E., *Ghosts and Spirits in the Ancient World* (London,1930).
Dittenberger W., *Sylloge inscriptionum Graecarum III* (Leipzig, ^{3}1915).
Dodge B. (ed., transl.), *The Fihirist of al-Nadim: a tenth-century survey of Muslim culture* (New York, 1970).
Dohm H., *Mageiros: Die Rolle des Kochs in der griechisch-römischen Komödie* (München, 1964).
Donahue J., 'Euergetic Self-Representation and the Inscriptions at Satyricon 71.10', *CP* 94 (1999), 69-74.
Donnet D. (ed.), *Le traité Περὶ συντάξεως λόγου de Grégoire de Corinthe* (Bruxelles/Roma, 1967).
Doody M.A., *The True Story of the Novel* (New Brunswick, 1996).
Doufikar-Aerts F.C.W., 'A Legacy of the *Alexander Romance* in Arabic Historical Writings: Al-Iskandar, Founder of Alexandria', in Tatum (1994), 323-43.
——, '*Les derniers jours d'Alexandre* dans un roman populaire arabe: un miroir du roman syriaque du Pseudo-Callisthène', in *Alexandre le Grand dans les littératures occidentales et proche-orientales. Actes du colloque de Paris 27-29 novembre 1997* (Paris, 1999), 61-75.
——, 'The marginal voice of a popular romance: Sirat al-Iskandar wa-ma fiha min al-'ajayib wa-l-gharayib', in *Marginal Voices in Literature and Society. Individual and Society in the Mediterranean Muslim World* , ed. Robin Ostle (Strasbourg, 2000), 13-24. [= Doufikar-Aerts (2000a)]
——, '*Epistola Alexandri ad Aristotelem* Arabica', in *La diffusione dell'eredità classica nell'età tardoantica e medievale. Filologia, storia, dottrina*, ed. C. Baffioni (Alessandria, 2000), 35-51. [= Doufikar-Aerts (2000b)]
——, *Alexander Magnus Arabicus. Zeven eeuwen Alexandertraditie: van Pseudo-Callisthenes tot Suri* (diss. Leiden, 2003).
Dowden K., 'Pseudo-Callisthenes. The Alexander Romance', in *CAGN* (1989), 650-735.
——, 'Cupid and Psyche: A Question of the Vision of Apuleius', in *AAGA* 2 (1998), 1-22.
Drake G., 'The ghost story in the *Golden Ass* by Apuleius', *PLL* 13 (1977), 3-15.
Dunlop D.M., *Arab Civilization to AD 1500* (London/Beirut, 1971).
Dunn F., Cole T. (edd.), *Beginnings in Classical Literature*. Yale Classical Studies, 29 (Cambridge, 1992).
Durham D., 'Parody in Achilles Tatius', *CP* 33 (1938), 1-19.
Duri A.A., *The Rise of Historical Writing among the Arabs*, transl. L. Conrad (Princeton, 1983).
Durkheim E., *The Division of Labor in Society* (Glencoe, Ill., 1960).
Duval F., *La literature syriaque* (Paris, 1899).
Dyck A.R. (ed.), *Michael Psellus, The Essay on Euripides and George of Pisidia and on Heliodorus and Achilles Tatius* (Wien, 1986).
Eco U., *The Name of the Rose*. transl. William Weaver (San Diego, 1983).
——, *L'isola del giorno prima* (Milano, 1994).
——, *Six Walks in the Fictional Woods* (Cambridge, Mass., 1994). [= Eco (1994a)] German translation: Kroeber B., *Im Wald der Fiktionen. Sechs Streifzüge durch die Literatur* (München, 1996).
——, *Die Insel des vorigen Tages*. Roman. Aus dem Italienischen von B. Kroeber (München/Wien, 1995).

Edlow R. B., *Galen on Language and Ambiguity* (Leiden, 1977).

Edwards D.R., 'Defining the Web of Power in Asia Minor: The Novelist Chariton and his City Aphrodisias', *JAAR* 67 (1993), 699-718.

Effe B., 'Longos. Zur Funktionsgeschichte der Bukolik in der römischen Kaiserzeit', *Hermes* 110 (1982), 65-84; translated as 'Longus: towards a History of Bucolic and its Function in the Roman Empire', in Swain (1999), 189-209.

——, 'Die Einführung dargestellter Personen im griechischen Liebesroman: ein Beitrag zur narrativen Technik und ihrer Evolution', in Picone, Zimmermann (1997), 76-88.

Egger B., 'Zu den Frauenrollen im griechischen Roman. Die Frau als Heldin und Leserin', in *GCN* 1 (1988), 33-66. [transl. in Swain (1999), 108-36]

——, *Women in the Greek Novel: Constructing the Feminine* (Diss. Irvine, 1990).

——, 'Looking at Chariton's Callirhoe', in Morgan, Stoneman (1994), 31-48.

Eisenhut W. (ed.), *Dictys Cretensis, Ephemeridos Belli Troiani Libri a Lucio Septimio ex Graeco in Latinum Sermonem Translati, Accedunt Papyri Dictys Graeci in Aegypto Inventae* (Stuttgart/Leipzig, ^{2}1994).

Elm S., *'Virgins of God.' The Making of Asceticism in Late Antiquity* (Oxford, 1994).

Elsom H., 'Callirhoe: Displaying the Phallic Woman', in Richlin (ed.) (1992), 212-30.

Endress G., Review of Brocker (1966), *Oriens* 21-2 (1968-9), 411-16.

Erim K., *City of Venus Aphrodite* (New York, 1986).

Ernout A., *Pétrone. Le Satiricon* (Paris, 1950).

Ersch J.S., Gruber J.G., *Allgemeine Encyclopaedie der Wissenschaften und Künste*, XXXV (Leipzig, 1841).

Fahd T., 'La version arabe du roman d'Alexandre', *Graeco-Arabica* 4 (1991), 25-32.

Fairclough H.R. (ed.), *Horace. Satires, Epistles and Ars Poetica. With an English translation* (London/Cambridge, 1926).

—— (ed.), *Virgil. With an English translation by H.R.F., revised by G.P. Goold. Vol. I: Eclogues, Georgics, Aeneid I-VI* (Cambridge/London, 1999).

Faulkner W., *Sanctuary* (New York, 1931).

——, *The Unvanquished* (New York, 1938).

Feeney D., 'Epilogue. Towards an Account of the Ancient World's Concepts of Fictive Belief', in Gill, Wiseman (1993), 230-44.

Fehling D., *Ethologische Überlegungen auf dem Gebiet der Altertumskunde. Phallische Demonstration - Fernsicht - Steinigung* (München, 1974).

Feldherr A., *Spectacle and Society in Livy's History* (Berkeley, 1998).

Felton D., *Haunted Greece and Rome. Ghost Stories from Classical Antiquity* (Austin, 1999).

Ferrari F. (ed.), *Romanzo di Esopo* (Milano, 1997).

Fetterley J., *The Resisting Reader: A Feminist Approach to American Fiction* (Bloomington, Indiana, 1978).

Finazzi R.B., Valvo A. (edd.), *La diffusione dell'eredita classica nell'eta tardoantica e medioevale: Il Romanzo di Alessandro e altri scritti* (Alessandria, 1998).

Finkelpearl E, 'Psyche, Aeneas and an Ass: Apuleius *Met*. 6.10-6.21', *TAPA* 120 (1990), 333-48. [reprinted in Harrison (1999), 290-306]

——, *Metamorphosis of Language in Apuleius. A Study of Allusion in the Novel* (Ann Arbor, 1998).

Finucane R.C., *Ghosts. Appearances of the dead and cultural transformation* (Amherst, NY, ^{2}1996).

Fitzgerald W., *Slavery and the Roman Literary Imagination* (Cambridge, 2000).

Flinterman J.-J., '"…largely fictions…": Aelius Aristides on Plato's dialogues', *AN* 1 (Groningen, 2002), 32-54.
Fochler P., *Fiktion als Historie: Der Trojanische Krieg in der deutschen Literatur des 16. Jahrhunderts.* Wissensliteratur im Mittelalter, 4 (Wiesbaden, 1990).
Forbes C. A., 'Charite and Dido', *CW* 37 (1943), 39-40.
Förster R., *De Aristotelis quae feruntur secretis secretorum commentatio* (Kiel, 1888).
——, *Libanii opera 8, Progymnasmata, argumenta orationum Demosthenicarum* (Leipzig, 1915).
Fowler P.G., 'Lucretian Conclusions', in Roberts, Dunn, Fowler (1997), 112-38.
Fowler D.P., *Roman Constructions* (Oxford, 2000).
——, 'Writing with Style: The Prologue to Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* between Fingierte Mündlichkeit and Textuality', in Kahane, Laird (2001), 225-30.
Fraenkel E., *Horace* (Oxford, 1957).
Franchi de'Cavalieri P., *La Passio SS. Perpetuae et Felicitatis* (Roma, 1896) [= *Scritti Agiografici* vol. I (1893-1900), Città del Vaticano, 1962, 41-155]
——, *S. Agnese nella tradizione e nella legenda* (Roma, 1899) [= *Scritti Agiografici* vol. I (1893-1900), Città del Vaticano, 1962, 293-381]
——, *Hagiographica* (Roma, 1908).
——, *Note Agiografiche VIII* (Città del Vaticano, 1935).
Francis J.A., *Subversive Virtue. Asceticism and Authority in the Second-Century Pagan World* (University Park, PA, 1995).
Frangoulidis S.A., 'Epic inversion in Apuleius' tale of Tlepolemus/Haemus', *Mnemosyne* 45 (1992), 60-74. [= Frangoulidis (1992a)]
——, 'Charite's Literary Models: Vergil's Dido and Homer's Odysseus', in Deroux (1992), 435-50. [= Frangoulidis (1992b)]
——, 'Homeric allusions to the Cyclopeia in Apuleius' description of the robbers' cave', *PP* 47 (1992), 50-8. [= Frangoulidis (1992c)]
——, 'The *somnus funestus* and *somnus uanus* of Charite: Apuleius, *Met*. 4.27 (95.16)', *Latomus* 52 (1993), 105-11.
——, 'Wedding imagery in Apuleius' tale of Tlepolemus/Haemus', *A&R* 41.4 (1996), 196-202.
——, 'Theatre and spectacle in Apuleius' tale of the robber Thrasyleon (*Met*. 4.13-21)', *Drama* 8 (1999), 113-35.
——, '*Scaena feralium nuptiarum*: wedding imagery in Apuleius' tale of Charite (*Metamorphoses* 8, 1-14)', *AJP* 120 (2000), 601-19.
Frank J., *The Idea of Spatial Form* (New Brunswick, 1991).
Franzosa B., *Grateful Dead Folktales* (Orono, Maine, 1989).
Fraser P. M., *Ptolemaic Alexandria I* (Oxford, 1972).
Fredrick D., 'Beyond the Atrium to Ariadne: Erotic Painting and Visual Pleasure in the Roman House', *ClAnt* 14 (1995), 266-87.
Frenzel E., *Motive der Weltliteratur* (Stuttgart, ²1980).
——, *Stoffe der Weltliteratur* (Stuttgart, ⁶1983).
Friedlaender I., *Die Chadhirlegende und der Alexanderroman* (Leipzig, 1913).
Friedrich H.-V. (ed.), *Thessalos von Tralles: Griechisch und Lateinisch*. Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie, 28 (Meisenheim am Glan, 1968).
Frye N., *The Secular Scripture* (Cambridge, Mass., 1976).
Frye R.N., 'Two Iranian Notes', in *Papers in honour of Mary Boyce*, ed. H.W. Bailey (Leiden, 1985), I, 185-90.
Fusillo M., 'Le Miroir de la Lune: L' "Historie vraie" de Lucien, de la satire à l'utopie', *Poétique* 19/73 (1988), 109-35; translated as 'The Mirror of the

Moon: Lucian's *A True Story* – From Satire to Utopia', in Swain (1999), 351-81.
——, *Il romanzo greco. Polifonia ed eros* (Venezia, 1989).
——, *Naissance du roman* (Paris, 1991).
——, 'Modern Critical Theories and the Ancient Novel', in Schmeling (ed.) (1996), 277-305.
——, 'Negation du commencement', in Bessière (2001), 141-58.
Futre Pinheiro M., 'Calasiris' Story and its Narrative Significance in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*', in *GCN* 4 (1991), 69-83.
Galinsky G.K., *The Herakles Theme* (Oxford, 1972).
Gallavotti G., 'Novi Laurentiani codicis analecta', *Studi Bizantini e Neoellenici* 4 (1935), 205-36.
Gallop D., 'Dreaming and Waking in Plato', in *Essays in Ancient Greek Philosophy*, vol. 1, edd. J. Anton with G. Kustas (Albany, New York, 1971), 187-201.
Gantz T., *Early Greek Mythology* (Baltimore, 1993).
Garcia Gomez E., *Un texto Arabe occidental de la Leyenda de Alejandro*, edition and Spanish translation (Madrid, 1929).
García Gual C., 'Le temps de la narration dans les romans anciens', in Bessière (2001), 11-22.
Garnaud J. Ph. (texte et trad.), *Achille Tatius, Le Roman de Leucippé et Clitophon*, (Paris, 1991).
Garnsey P., *Social Status and Legal Privilege in the Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1970).
Gärtner H. (ed.), *Beiträge zum griechischen Liebesroman*. Olms Studien, 20 (Hildesheim, 1984).
Gaselee S. (ed.), *Achilles Tatius, with an English translation* (Cambridge, Mass., 1917).
Gasse H., *Heliodor: Die äthiopischen Abenteuer von Theagenes und Charikleia*. Übers. u. Anm. von H. Gasse. Nachwort von H. Dörrie (Stuttgart, 1972).
Gaster Moses (ed.), *Studies and texts in folklore, magic, mediaeval romance, Hebrew Apocrypha, and Samaritan archaeology*. 3 vols. (London, 1925-28).
——, 'An Old Hebrew Romance of Alexander', *JRAS* (1897), 485-549, reprinted in Gaster (1925-28), vol. II, 814-78.
Genette G., *Figures III. Discours du récit* (Paris, 1972). = *Narrative Discourse*. Transl. by J.E. Lewin; forew. by J. Culler (Ithaca, 1980).
——, *Nouveau discours du récit* (Paris, 1983).
——, *Palimpsests. Literature in the Second Degree* (Lincoln, Neb., 1997). [First published in French as *Palimpsestes. La littérature au second degré* (Paris, 1982)]
——, *Architext: An Introduction* (Berkeley/Los Angeles, 1992).
Georgiadou A., Larmour D., *Lucian's Science Fiction Novel: True Histories*. Mnemosyne Supplement, 179 (Leiden/Boston/Köln, 1998).
Gerhardt M., *The Art of Storytelling* (Leiden, 1963).
Gero S., 'The Legend of Alexander the Great in the Christian Orient', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 75 (1993), 3-9.
Gibson R., Kraus C. (edd.), *The Classical Commentary* (Leiden, 2002).
Gigante M., 'Il romanzo di Eusthatios Makrembolites', in *Akten des XI. Internationalen Byzantinistenkongresses, München, 1958*, edd. F. Dölger, H.G. Beck (München, 1960), 168-81.
Gilbert S., Gubar S., *The Madwoman in the Attic* (New Haven, 1979).
Gill C., Wiseman T.P. (edd.), *Lies and Fiction in the Ancient World* (Exeter, 1993).

Gill C., 'Plato's Atlantis Story and the Birth of Fiction', *Philosophy and Literature* 3 (1979), 64-78.
—— (transl.), 'Longus. Daphnis and Chloe', in *CAGN* (1989), 285-348.
——, 'Plato on Falsehood--not Fiction', in Gill, Wiseman (1993), 38-87.
Gleason M.W., 'Truth Contests and Talking Corpses', in *Constructions of the Classical Body*, ed. J.I. Porter (Ann Arbor, 1999), 287-313.
Glenn I., *A Short History of Julia* (New York, 1930).
Godzich, W., Kittay J., *The Emergence of Prose: An Essay in Prosaics* (Minneapolis, 1987).
Goetze E. (ed.), *Sämmtliche Fastnachtspiele von Hans Sachs*. 7 vols. (Halle, 1880-7).
Goldhill S., *Foucault's Virginity. Ancient Erotic Fiction and the History of Sexuality* (Cambridge, 1995).
Gollnick J., *The Religious Dreamworld of Apuleius' Metamorphoses* (Waterloo, 1999).
Goodman L., 'Translation of Greek Materials into Arabic', in Young, Latham, Serjeant (1990), 487-97.
Goold G.P. (ed. and transl.), *Chariton, Callirhoe* (Cambridge Mass./London, 1995).
Gordon R. 'Imagining Greek and Roman Magic', in *Witchcraft and Magic in Europe. Ancient Greece and Rome*, edd. B. Ankarloo, St. Clark (Philadelphia, 2000), 159-276.
Gras M., 'Cité grecque et lapidation', in *Du châtiment dans la cité. Supplices corporels et peine de mort dans le monde antique*. Table ronde organisée par l'École française de Rome avec le concours du Centre national de la recherche scientifique (Rome 9-11 novembre 1982), (Paris, 1984), 75-89.
Graverini L., '*In historiae specimen* (Apul. *Metamorphoses* 8.1.4). Elementi della letteratura storiografica nelle *Metamorfosi* di Apuleio', *Prometheus* 23 (1997), 247-78.
——, 'Memorie virgiliane nelle *Metamorfosi* di Apuleio: il racconto di Telifrone (II 19-30) e l'assalto dei coloni ai servi fuggitivi (VIII 16-18)', *Maia* 50 (1998), 123-45.
——, 'Apul. *met.* 2,12,5: una profezia ambigua', *Maecenas* 1 (2001), 183-94.
Green P., 'Longus, Antiphon and the Topography of Lesbos', *JHS* 102 (1982), 210-14.
Griffith M. (ed.), *Aeschylus, Prometheus bound* (Cambridge, 1983).
Grignaschi M., 'Le roman épistolaire classique conservé dans la version arabe de Selim abu-l Ala'', *Le Museon* 89 (1967), 211-64.
——, 'La figure d'Alexandre chez les arabes et sa génèse', *Arabic Sciences and Philosophy* 3 (1993), 205-34.
——, 'Un roman épistolaire gréco-arabe: la correspondance entre Aristote et Alexandre', in Bridges, Bürgel (1996), 109-23.
Grimal P. (transl.), *Romans grecs et latins* (Paris, 1958).
Gutas D., *Greek Wisdom Literature in Arabic Translation* (New Haven, 1975).
——, *Greek Thought, Arabic Culture* (London, 1998).
Habinek T., 'Lucius' Rite of Passage', *MD* 25 (1990), 49-69.
Habrich E. (ed.), *Iamblichi Babyloniacorum Reliquiae* (Leipzig, 1960).
Hägg T., *Narrative Techniques in Ancient Greek Romances. Studies of Chariton, Xenophon Ephesius and Achilles Tatius*. Skrifter utgivna av Svenska Institutet i Athen, 8° (Stockholm, 1971).
——, *The Novel in Antiquity* (Berkeley/Los Angeles, 1983).

——, ‘Callirhoe and Parthenope: the Beginnings of the Historical Novel’, *ClAnt* 6 (1987), 184-204.

——, ‘A Professor and his Slave: Conventions and Values in the Life of Aesop’, in *Conventional values of the Hellenistic Greeks*, ed. P. Bilde et al. (Aarhus, 1997), 177-203.

Haines-Eitzen K., *Guardians of letters: literacy, power, and the transmitters of early Christian literature* (Oxford, 2000).

Hallett J.P., ‘The Role of Women in Roman Elegy: Counter-Cultural Feminism’, *Arethusa* 6.1 (1973), 103-124.

——, ‘Ovid’s Polyphemus Narrative (*Metamorphoses* 13.738-897) and Horace’s Description of the *Fons Bandusiae* (*Odes* 3.13): *Odium et Amor* in the ‘Resisting’ Galatea’, paper presented [with students in Latin 302, “Ovid”, at the University of Maryland] at the fall meeting of the Classical Association of the United States, October 12, 1990.

Halliwell S., *Aristotle’s Poetics* (London, 1986).

Hallyn F., ‘Le fictif, le vrai et le faux’, in Herman, Hallyn (1999), 489-506.

Halperin D.M., Winkler J.J., Zeitlin F.I. (edd.), *Before Sexuality: The Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient Greek World* (Princeton, 1990).

Halperin D.M., ‘Plato and the Erotics of Narrativity’, in *Methods of Interpreting Plato and His Dialogues* (*OSAPh* suppl. vol.), edd. J.C. Klagge, N.D. Smith (Oxford, 1992), 93-129. [this essay also appeared in *Innovations of antiquity*, edd. R. Hexter, D. Selden (New York, 1992), 95-126]

——, ‘Historicizing the subject of desire: sexual preferences and erotic identities in the pseudo-Lucianic *Erôtes*’, in *Foucault and the writing of history,* ed. J. Goldstein (Oxford, 1994), 17-34.

Haltenhoff A., *Kritik der akademischen Skepsis. Ein Kommentar zu Cicero, Lucullus 1-62*. Studien zur klassischen Philologie, 113 (Frankfurt a. Main, 1998).

Halton T.P., *Saint Jerome, On Illustrious Men* (Washington, D.C., 1999).

Hamori A., *On the art of medieval Arabic literature* (Princeton, 1974).

Hanhart R. (ed.), *Tobit* (Göttingen, 1983).

Hanson J. (ed./transl.), *Apuleius: Metamorphoses*. 2 vols. (Cambridge, Mass., 1989).

Hansen W., *Phlegon of Tralles’ Book of Marvels* (Exeter, 1996).

——, ‘Homer and the folktale’, in *New Companion to Homer,* edd. I. Morris, B. Powell (Leiden, 1997), 442-62.

—— (ed.), *Anthology of Ancient Greek Popular Literature* (Bloomington/Indianapolis, 1998).

Harrison S.J., ‘The Speaking Book: The Prologue to Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses*’, *CQ* n.s. 40 (1990), 507-13. [= Harrison (1990a)]

——, ‘Some Odyssean Scenes in Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses*’, *MD* 25 (1990), 193-201. [= Harrison (1990b)]

——, ‘From Epic to Novel: Apuleius as Reader of Vergil’, *MD* 39 (1997), 53-74.

——, ‘Some Epic Structures in *Cupid and Psyche’*, in *AAGA* 2 (1998), 51-68. [= Harrison (1998a)]

——, ‘The Milesian Tales and the Roman Novel’, in *GCN* 9 (1998), 61-73. [= Harrison (1998b)]

——, ‘Dividing the Dinner: Book-Divisions in Petronius’ *Cena Trimalchionis*’, *CQ* n.s. 48 (1998), 580-8. [= Harrison (1998c)]

—— (ed.), *Oxford Readings in the Roman Novel* (Oxford, 1999).

——, *Apuleius, A Latin Sophist* (Oxford, 2000).

Harvey A.E., *Economic Expansion in the Byzantine Empire, 900-1200* (Cambridge, 1989).

Haslam M., 'Narrative about Tinouphis in Prosimetrum (P. Hauniensis inv. 400)', in *Papyri: Greek and Egyptian, Edited by Various Hands in Honour of Eric Gardner Turner on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday* (London, 1981), 35-45.

——, '3720. Life of Aesop (Addendum to 3331)', in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 53 (1986), 149-72.

Haynes K.C.M., 'Power of the Prude: Configurations of the Feminine in the Greek Novel', *AN* 1 (Groningen, 2002), 73-92.

Helbig J., *Intertextualität und Markierung. Untersuchungen zur Systematik und Funktion der Signalisierung von Intertextualität* (Heidelberg, 1996).

Helm R. (ed.), *Apuleius Metamorphoseon Libri XI* (Leipzig/Stuttgart, 1992, repr. of 1955 [=[3]1931, cum addendis et corrigendis]).

Henderson J., 'The life and soul of the party: Plato, *Symposium*', in Sharrock, Morales (2000), 287-324.

——, 'In Ya (Pre)face …', in Kahane, Laird (2001), 188-97.

Herman J., *Le mensonge romanesque: paramètres pour l'étude du roman épistolaire en France* (Leuven, 1989).

Herman J., Hallyn F. (edd.), *Le topos du manuscrit trouvé. Hommages à Christian Angelet. Études réunies et présentées par Jan Herman et Fernand Hallyn avec la collaboration de Kris Peeters*. Bibliothèque de l'Information Grammaticale, 40 (Louvain/Paris, 1999).

Hershkowitz D., *The Madness of Epic* (Oxford, 1998).

Hesse H., *Der Steppenwolf* (Berlin, 1928).

Hexter R., Review of Kortekaas (1984), *Speculum* 63 (1988), 186-90.

Highet G., 'Petronius the Moralist', *TAPA* 72 (1941), 176-94.

Hijmans B.L., 'Charite worships Tlepolemus-Liber', *Mnemosyne* 39 (1986), 350-64.

Hijmans B.L. Jr. et al., *Apuleius Madaurensis. Metamorphoses. Book IV. 1-27. Text, Introduction and Commentary* (Groningen, 1977). [= *GCA* (1977)]

—— (edd.), *Apuleius Madaurensis. Metamorphoses. Books VI 25-32 and VII. Text, Introduction and Commentary* (Groningen, 1981). [= *GCA* (1981)]

—— (edd.), *Apuleius Madaurensis Metamorphoses Book VIII. Text, Introduction and Commentary* (Groningen, 1985). [= *GCA* (1985)]

—— (edd.), *Apuleius Madaurensis. Metamorphoses Book IX. Text, Introduction and Commentary* (Groningen, 1995). [= *GCA* (1995)]

Hilgenfeld A. (ed.), *Hermae Pastor* (Leipzig, 1887).

Hinard F., 'Spectacle des exécutions et espace urbain', in *L'Urbs. Espace urbain et histoire (Ier siècle av. J.-C. - IIIe siècle ap. J.-C.)*. Actes du colloque international organisé par le Centre national de la recherche scientifique et l'École française de Rome (Rome, 8-12 mai 1985), (École française de Rome, 1987), 111-25.

Hinterberger M., *Autobiographische Traditionen in Byzanz* (Wien, 1999).

Hirzel R., 'Die Strafe der Steinigung', *ASGW* 27 (1909), 223-66 (= Darmstadt, 1967).

Hock R.F., Bradley Chance J., Perkins J. (edd.), *Ancient Fiction and Early Christian Narrative* (Atlanta, 1998).

Hofmann H., 'Sprachhandlung und Kommunikationspotential: Diskursstrategien im *Goldenen Esel*', in Picone, Zimmermann (1997), 137-69.

—— (ed.), *Latin Fiction. The Latin Novel in Context* (London/New York, 1999).

Hohlenberg J., *Sören Kierkegaard*. Translated by T.H. Croxall (New York, 1954).

Holum K.G., *Theodosian Empresses. Women and Imperial Dominion in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley, 1982).

Holzberg N., 'Die *Tragedis* und *Comedis* des Hans Sachs: Forschungssituation - Forschungsperspektiven', in Brunner, Hirschmann, Schnelbögl (1976), 105-36.
——, 'The *Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri* and the *Odyssey*', in *GCN* 3 (1990), 91-101.
—— (ed.), *Der Äsop-Roman: Motivgeschichte und Erzählstruktur* (Tübingen, 1992).
——, 'Der Äsop-Roman: Eine strukturanalytische Interpretation', in Holzberg (ed.) (1992), 33-75. [= Holzberg (1992a)]
——, 'Das Verhältnis der Spielhandlung zu der *angehenckten lehr* in der Lucretia-Tragödie des Hans Sachs', in '*Der Buchstab tödt – der Geist macht lebendig': Festschrift H.-G. Roloff*, edd. J. Hardin, J. Jungmayr, vol. 1 (Bern, etc., 1992), 533-52. [= Holzberg (1992b)]
——, 'A Lesser Known 'Picaresque' Novel of Greek Origin: The *Aesop Romance* and its Influence', in *GCN* 5 (1993), 1-16.
—— (ed.), *Der griechische Briefroman. Gattungstypologie und Textanalyse*. Classica Monacensia, 8 (Tübingen, 1994).
——, *The Ancient Novel: an Introduction* (London, 1995). [= Holzberg (1995a)]
——, 'Möglichkeiten und Grenzen humanistischer Antikerezeption: Willibald Pirckheimer und Hans Sachs als Vermittler klassischer Bildung', *Pirckheimer-Jahrbuch* 10 (1995), 9-29. [= Holzberg (1995b)]
——, 'Novel-like Works of Extended Prose Fiction II', in Schmeling (ed.) (1996), 619-53. [= Holzberg (1996a)]
——, 'Utopias and Fantastic Travel: Euhemerus, Iambulus', in Schmeling (ed.) (1996), 621-8. [= Holzberg (1996b)]
——, 'Fable: Aesop. Life of Aesop', in Schmeling (ed.) (1996), 633-9. [= Holzberg (1996c)]
——, 'Letters: Chion', in Schmeling (ed.) (1996), 645-53. [= Holzberg (1996d)]
——, '*Ter quinque volumina* as *carmen perpetuum*: the division into books in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*', *MD* 40 (1998), 77-98.
——, *Die antike Fabel: Eine Einführung* (Darmstadt, ^{2}2001).
Homer & Associates, *A Bedside Odyssey*. Translated by Gerald Williams (New York, 1967).
Hopf Ch., *Chroniques gréco-romanes, inédites ou peu connues* (Berlin, 1873).
Hopkins K., 'Novel Evidence for Roman Slavery', *P&P* 138 (1993), 3-27.
Hörandner W. (ed.), *Theodoros Prodromos, Historische Gedichte* (Wien, 1974).
Horney K., *Feminine Psychology* (New York, 1967).
Howell P., *Martial : The Epigrams Book V* (Warminster, 1995).
Hubbard M., *Propertius* (London, 1974).
Hunger H. (ed.), *Der byzantinische Katz-Mäuse-Krieg. Theodoros Prodromos, Katomyomachia* (Graz, 1968).
——, 'On the Imitation (ΜΙΜΗΣΙΣ) of Antiquity in Byzantine Literature', *DOP* 23-24 (1969/70), 17-38.
——, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*. Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, 12.5 (München, 1978).
Hunink, V.J.C., *Apuleius of Madauros. Pro se de magia*. 2 vols. (Amsterdam, 1997).
——, *Apuleius of Madauros, Florida, Edited with a Commentary* (Amsterdam, 2001).
Hunter R.L., *A study of 'Daphnis & Chloe'* (Cambridge, 1983).
——, 'History and Historicity in the Romance of Chariton', *ANRW* II.34.2 (1994), 1055-86.
—— (ed.), *Studies in Heliodorus* (Cambridge, 1998).

Imbert C., 'Stoic Logic and Alexandrian Poetics', in *Doubt and Dogmatism: Studies in Hellenistic Epistemology*, edd. M. Schofield etc. (Oxford, 1980), 182-216.
Irwin R., *The Arabian Nights; a companion* (London, 1994).
Iser W., *The act of reading: a theory of aesthetic response* (Baltimore, 1978).
Izenour G., *Roofed Theatres of Classical Antiquity* (New Haven, 1992).
Jackson R., *Fantasy: The Literature of Subversion* (London, 1981).
James P., *Unity in Diversity* (Hildesheim, 1987).
Jax K., *Die weibliche Schönheit in der griechischen Dichtung* (Innsbruck, 1933).
Jedrkiewicz S., *Sapere e paradosso nell'antichità: Esopo e la favola* (Roma, 1989).
——, *Il convitato sullo sgabello. Plutarco, Esopo ed i Sette Savi* (Pisa/Roma, 1997).
Jeffreys E. (ed.), *Digenis Akritis*. Cambridge Medieval Classics, 7 (Cambridge, 1998).
Jeffries R., '2,000-Year-Old Letter from Jesus Found!', *Weekly World News* (6 October 1998), 46-7.
Jenkins R.J.H., 'The Hellenistic Origins of Byzantine Literature', *DOP* 17 (1963), 38-52.
Jensen C., *Philodemus: Peri Poiematon* (Leipzig, 1923).
Johne R., 'Zur Figurencharakteristik im antiken Roman', in Kuch (1989), 150-77.
Johnson W., 'Dramatic Frame and Philosophical Idea in Plato', *AJP* 119 (1998), 577-98.
Johnston S.I., *The Restless Dead. Encounters between the Living and the Dead in Ancient Greece* (Berkeley, 1999).
Joly R. (ed., transl.), *Le Pasteur Hermas*. Sources chrétiennes, 53 (Paris, 1958).
Jones B.W., *Suetonius: Domitian* (Bristol, 1996).
Jones C.P., *Kinship Diplomacy in the Ancient World* (London, 1999).
Jonxis-Henkemans W.L., 'The Last Days of Alexander in General Estoria IV', in Aerts, Hermans, Visser (1978), 142-69.
Joret C., *La rose dans l'antiquité et au moyen âge. Histoire, légendes et symbolisme* (Paris, 1892).
Joshel S., 'Nurturing the Master's Child: Slavery and the Roman Child-Nurse', *Signs* 12.1 (1986), 3-22.
Jouanno C., 'Nicetas Eugénianos, un héritier du roman grec', *REG* 102 (1989), 346-60.
Jubaru F., *Sainte Agnès, Vierge et Martyre de la Voie Nomentane* (Paris, 1907).
Junghanns P., *Die Erzählungstechnik von Apuleius' Metamorphosen und ihrer Vorlage*. Philologus Suppl., 24.1 (Leipzig, 1932).
Kaegi W., *Byzantium and the Early Islamic Conquests* (Cambridge, 1992).
Kahane A., Laird A. (edd.), *A Companion to the Prologue of Apuleius'* Metamorphoses (Oxford, 2001).
Kahane A., 'Antiquity's future: Writing, Speech, and Representation in the Prologue to Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*', in Kahane, Laird (2001), 231-41.
Kahn C., *Plato and the Socratic Dialogue* (Cambridge, 1996).
Kampers F., *Alexander der Grosse und die Idee des Welt-Imperiums in Prophetie und Sage: Studien und Darstellungen aus dem Gebiete der Geschichte* I.3 (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1901).
Kayser K.L. (ed.), *Flavius Philostratus, Vitae Sophistarum* (Heidelberg, 1838; repr. Hildesheim, 1971).
Kazhdan A., Constable G., *People and power in Byzantium* (Washington D.C., 1982).
Kazhdan A., Franklin S., *Studies on Byzantine Literature of the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Cambridge/Paris, 1984).

Kazhdan A., Epstein A.W., *Change in Byzantine Culture in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Berkeley/Los Angeles/London, 1985).
Kazis I.J. (ed.), *The Gests of Alexander of Macedon* (Cambridge, Mass. 1962).
Kennedy J.P., *Swallow Barn* (Philadelphia, 1832).
Keulen W.H., 'Significant Names in Apuleius: A 'Good Contriver' and his Rival in the Cheese Trade', Apuleiana Groningana X, *Mnemosyne* 53, 3 (2000), 310-21.
——, *Apuleius, Metamorphoses, Book 1,1-20. Introduction, Text, and Commentary* (Diss. Groningen, 2003).
Khawan R.R. (transl.), *Le Livre des Ruses: la stratégie politique des Arabes* (Paris, 1976).
Khoury R.G., *Wahb ibn Munabbih.* 2 vols. (Wiesbaden, 1972).
Kierkegaard S., *Either/Or*. Translated by David F. Swenson and Lillian Marvin Swenson. 2 vols. (Garden City, 1959).
Kirk G.S., *The Iliad : A Commentary. Volume 1 : Books 1-4* (Cambridge, 1985).
Kirsch W., *Historie von Alexander dem Grossen,* German translation of the Latin *Historia de Preliis* I[1,2,3] (Leipzig, 1984).
Kittredge G., 'Arm-pitting among the Greeks', *AJP* 6 (1885), 151-69.
Klebs E., *Die Erzählung von Apollonius aus Tyrus* (Berlin, 1899).
Klein D., *Bildung und Belehrung: Untersuchungen zum Dramenwerk des Hans Sachs* (Stuttgart, 1988).
Kmosko M., 'Die Rätsel des Pseudo-Methodios', *Byzantion* 6 (1931), 273-96.
Kneale, W. and M., *The Development of Logic* (Oxford, 1962).
Knights C., 'The "Story of Zosimus" or "the History of the Rechabites"?', *JSJ* 24 (1993), 235-45.
——, 'Towards a Critical Introduction to the "history of the Rechabites"', *JSJ* 26 (1995), 324-42.
Knust H., *Mitteilungen aus dem Eskorial* (Tübingen, 1879).
Koehler R., *Aufsätze über Märchen und Volksslieder* (Berlin, 1894).
Koenen L., Flashar H., Gelzer Th., Maurer K., Theiler W., West M.L., 'Ein wiedergefundenes Archilochos-Gedicht?', *Poetica* 6 (1974), 468-512.
Kondis Y., 'Τὰ κατὰ Δάφνιν καὶ Χλόην τοῦ Λόγγου καὶ ἡ Λέσβος', *Αἰολικὰ Γράμματα* 2 (1972), 217-23.
Konstan D., *Sexual Symmetry: Love in the Ancient Novels and Related Genres* (Princeton, 1994).
——, 'The *Alexander Romance*: The Cunning of the Open Text', *Lexis* 16 (1998), 123-38.
Konstantinopoulos V., *Pseudo-Kallisthenes: Zwei mittelgriechische Prosafassungen des Alexanderromans,* II (Meisenheim am Glan, 1983).
Kortekaas G.A.A. (ed.), *Historia Apollonii regis Tyri* (Groningen, 1984).
——, 'Enigmas in and around the *Historia Apollonii regis Tyri*', *Mnemosyne* 51 (1998), 176-91.
Koster W.J.W. (ed.), *Prolegomena de Comoedia* (Groningen, 1975).
Kotansky R., 'Incantations and prayers for salvation on inscribed Greek amulets', in *Magika Hiera*, edd. C.A. Faraone, D. Obbink (Oxford, 1991), 107-37.
Koziol H., *Der Stil des L. Apuleius* (Vienna, 1872).
Krabbe J.K., *The Metamorphoses of Apuleius* (New York/Bern, 1989).
Krause H., *Die Dramen des Hans Sachs: Untersuchungen zur Lehre und Technik* (Berlin, 1979).
Krauß C., *'... und ohnehin die schönen Blumen'. Essays zur frühen christlichen Blumensymbolik* (Tübingen, 1994).

Krenkow, F. ‘The two oldest books on Arabic folklore’, *Islamic Culture* 2 (1928), 55-89; 204-36.
Kriaras E. (ed.), ‘Βυζαντινὰ ἱπποτικὰ μυθιστορήματα’, *Βασικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη* 2, Athens 1955, 101-30.
Kristeva J., *Séméiôtikè: recherches pour une sémanalyse* (Paris, 1969).
Krumbacher K., *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur von Justinian bis zum Ende des Oströmischen Reiches (527-1453)* (München, [2]1897).
Kuch H., *Der antike Roman. Untersuchungen zur literarischen Kommunikation und Gattungsgeschichte* (Berlin, 1989).
Küchler M., *Frühjüdische Weisheitstraditionen* (Göttingen, 1979).
Kussl R., *Papyrusfragmente griechischer Romane. Ausgewählte Untersuchungen*, Tübingen (1991).
——, ‘Achikar, Tinuphis und Äsop’, in Holzberg (ed.) (1992), 23-30.
Kyle D.G., *Spectacles of Death in Ancient Rome* (London/New York, 1998).
La Penna A., ‘Il Romanzo di Esopo’, *Athenaeum* n. s. 40 (1962), 264-314.
Lacan J., *Écrits* (Paris, 1966).
Laird A., ‘Person, “Persona” and Representation in Apuleius’s *Metamorphoses*’, *MD* 25 (1990), 129-64.
——, ‘Fiction, Bewitchment and Story Worlds: The Implications of Claims to Truth in Apuleius’, in Gill, Wiseman (1993), 147-74.
——, ‘Ringing the Changes on Gyges: Philosophy and the formation of fiction in Plato’s Republic’, *JHS* 121 (2001), 12-29.
Lamarque P., Olsen S.H., *Truth, Fiction, and Literature: A Philosophical Perspective* (Oxford/New York, 1994).
Lambert-van der Kolf J.A. (ed.), *Le Roman de Libistros and Rhodamne*. Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde, N. R. 35 (Amsterdam, 1935).
Lampros S., ‘Ἐπιγράμματα ἀνέκδοτα’, *Νέος Ἑλληνομνήμων* 11 (1914), 353-8.
Lanata G., *Gli atti dei martiri come documenti processuali* (Milano, 1973).
Lane E.W., *The Thousand and One Nights*. I-III (London, 1859/1979).
Lane Fox R., *Pagans and Christians* (New York, 1986).
LaPlace M., ‘Les légendes troyennes dans le “roman” de Chariton, Chairéas et Callirhoé’, *REG* 93 (1980), 83-125.
Lardet P., *L’apologie de Jérôme contre Rufin. Un commentaire* (Leiden/New York/Köln, 1993).
Lasserre F., ‘La fable en Grèce dans la poésie archaïque’, in Adrados, Reverdin (1984), 61-103.
Lateiner D., ‘Abduction marriage in Heliodorus’ *Aethiopica*’, *GRBS* 38 (1997/2000), 409-39.
——, ‘Blushes and Pallor in Ancient Fictions’, *Helios* 25 (1998), 163-89.
——, ‘Marriage and the return of spouses in Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses*’, *CJ* 95.4 (2000), 313-32.
——, ‘Humiliation and immobility in Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses*’, *TAPA* 131 (2001), 217-55.
Lattimore R., *Themes in Greek and Roman Epitaphs* (Urbana, 1935/1962).
Lauxtermann M., ‘Three Biographical Notes’, *BZ* 91 (1998), 391-405.
Lawlor H. J., Oulton J. E. L. (transl.), *Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History and the Martyrs of Palestine* (New York, 1927-28).
Lazzarini C.I., ‘Il modello Virgiliano nel lessico delle *Metamorfosi* di Apuleio’, *SCO* 35 (1986), 131-60.
Leach E., ‘The Punishment of Dirce’, *MDAI(R)* 93 (1986), 157-82, pls. 49-59.

Létoublon F., 'Le miroir et la boucle', *Poétique* 40 (1983), 19-35.
——, 'Le messager fidèle', in *Beyond Oral Poetry*, edd. J.M. Bremer, I.J.F. De Jong, J. Kalff (Amsterdam, 1987), 123-44.
——, *Les lieux communs du roman* (Leiden, 1993).
——, 'Said Over the Dead or *Tant de marbre parlant sur tant d'ombre*', *Arethusa* 28 (1995), 1-19.
Lewis C.S., *The Allegory of Love* (Oxford, 1936).
Lidzbarski M.A., 'Zu den arabischen Alexandergeschichten', *ZA* 8 (1893), 263-312.
Lieberg G., *Poeta Creator. Studien zu einer Figur der antiken Dichtung* (Amsterdam, 1982).
Lindenberger J.M. (transl.), 'Ahiqar. A new translation and introduction', in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. J.H. Charlesworth (London, 1985), II, 479-507.
Liviabella Furiani P., Rossetti L. (edd.), *Antonio M. Scarcella. Romanzo e romanzieri: note di narratologia greca*, 2 vols. (Napoli, 1993).
Lock P., *The Franks in the Aegean 1204-1500* (London/New York, 1995).
Lolos A., *Die Apokalypse des Pseudo-Methodios* (Meisenheim am Glan, 1976).
——, *Die dritte und vierte Redaktion des Pseudo-Methodios* (Meisenheim am Glan, 1978).
——, *Pseudo-Kallisthenes; Zwei mittelgriechische Prosafassungen des Alexanderromans* I. (Meisenheim am Glan, 1983).
Lolos A., 'The Arabic translation of the later prose romance of Pseudo-Callisthenes on Alexander the Great', *Graeco-Arabica* 3 (1984), 191-202 (in Greek).
López Martínez M.P., *Fragmentos papiráceos de novela griega*, Tesis Univ. de Alicante (1993).
——, *Fragmentos papiráceos de novela griega* (Alicante, 1998).
Lowe N.J., *The Classical Plot and the Invention of Western Narrative* (Cambridge, 2000).
Luzzatto M.J., 'Grecia e vicino oriente: tracce della 'storia di Ahiqar' nella cultura greca tra VI e V secolo a.C.', *QS* 18 (1992), 5-84.
——, 'Ancora sulla 'storia di Ahiqar'', *QS* 39 (1994), 253-77.
——, 'Esopo', in *I Greci*, ed. S. Settis (Torino, 1996), 2.1, 1307-24.
Lyons M.C., *The Arabian Epic. Heroic and Oral Story-telling*, 3 vols. (Cambridge, 1995).
MacAlister S., 'Aristotle on the Dream: a Twelfth-Century Romance Revival', *Byzantion* 60 (1990), 195-212.
——, *Dreams & Suicides. The Greek Novel from Antiquity to the Byzantine Empire* (London/New York, 1996).
Mac-Guckin de Slane W., *Catalogue des manuscrits arabes de la Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris* (Paris, 1883-1895).
MacMullen R., *Roman Social Relations 50 BC - AD 284* (New Haven, 1974).
——, 'Judicial Savagery in the Roman Empire', in idem, *Changes in the Roman Empire: Essays in the Ordinary* (Princeton, New Jersey, 1990), 204-17, 357-64 [orig. publ., *Chiron* 16 (1986), 147-66]
MacQueen B., *Myth, Rhetoric and Fiction: A Reading of Longus's* Daphnis and Chloe (Lincoln, 1990).
Macuch R., 'Egyptian Sources and Versions of Pseudo-Callisthenes', in *Egitto e storia antica dall'ellenismo all'età Araba: bilancio di un confronto. Atti del colloquio internazionale, Bologna, 31 agosto-2 settembre 1987*, ed. L. Criscuolo, G. Geraci (Bologna, 1989).
——, 'Pseudo-Callisthenes Orientalis and the Problem of Dulqarnain', *Graeco-Arabica* 4 (1991), 223-64.

Magdalino P., 'Eros the King and the King of Amours. Some Observations on Hysmine and Hysminias', *DOP* 46 (1992), 197-204.
——, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos, 1142-1180* (Cambridge, 1993).
Manfredini M., Piccirilli L. (edd.), *Plutarco, Le vite di Licurgo e di Numa* (Verona, 1980).
Manieri A., *L'immagine poetica nella teoria degli antichi: phantasia ed enargeia* (Pisa, 1998).
Manzalaoui M.A., 'The Pseudo-Aristotelian Kitab al-Asrar', *Oriens* 24 (1974), 145-257.
—— (ed.), *Secretum Secretorum: Nine English Versions*. EETS, 276 (Oxford, 1977).
Marcovich M. (ed.), *Theodori Prodromi De Rhodanthes et Dosiclis amoribus libri IX* (Stuttgart/Leipzig, 1992).
Mardrus J.C., Mathers P. *The Thousand Nights and One Night* (London, 1964).
Marinčič M., 'Die Symbolik im Buch Tobit und der Achikar-Roman', in *Sertum Gantarianum. Ziva antika,* 45 (1995), 199-212.
Marini N., 'Δρᾶμα: possibile denominazione per il romanzo greco d'amore', *SIFC* 3.ser.9 (1991), 232-43.
Maritz J., 'The Role of Music in Daphnis and Chloe', in *GCN* 4 (1991), 57-67.
Mason H.J., '*Fabula Graecanica*: Apuleius and his Greek Sources', in *AAGA* (1978), 1-15.
——, 'Longus and the Topography of Lesbos', *TAPA* 109 (1979), 149-63.
——, 'Ancient Romances and Opera Libretti', in Tatum, Vernazza (1990), 29.
——, 'Romance in a Limestone Landscape', *CPh* 90 (1995), 263-6.
Masters J., *Poetry and civil war in Lucan's 'Bellum Civile'* (Cambridge, 1992).
Matsumoto N., 'The Urban Mob and the Christians', in *Forms of Control and Subordination in Antiquity*, ed. T. Yuge, M. Doi (Leiden, 1988), 543-50.
Mattiacci S., 'Riscritture apuleiane del *locus amoenus*', in *Studi in onore di M. R. Cataudella in occasione del 60° compleanno*, edd. S. Bianchetti et al. (La Spezia, 2001), 476-92.
Mavrogordato J. (ed.), *Digenes Akrites* (Oxford, 1956).
May R., 'Köche und Parasit. Elemente der Komödie in den *Metamorphosen* des Apuleius', in *GCN* 9 (1998), 131-55.
Mayer R.M. (ed.), *Horace. Epistles, Book I* (Cambridge, 1994).
Mazzaoui M.M., 'Alexander the Great and the Arab Historians', *Graeco-Arabica* 4 (1991), 33-43.
McCail R.C., 'Did Constantine of Sicily read *Daphnis and Chloe*?', *Byzantion* 58 (1988), 112-22.
McCreight T., 'Sacrificial Ritual in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*', in *GCN* 5 (1993), 31-61.
McGinn, B., *Antichrist* (San Francisco, 1994).
McGlathery D., 'Reversals of Platonic Love in Petronius' *Satyricon*', in *Rethinking Sexuality: Foucault and Classical Antiquity,* ed. D.H.J. Larmour, P.A. Miller, C. Platter (Princeton, 1998), 203-27.
Meissner B., 'Mubašširs Aḫbâr el-Iskender', edition and German translation, *ZDMG* (1895), 583-627.
Meister F. (ed.), *Dares Phrygius, De Excidio Troiae Historia* (Stuttgart/Leipzig, [2]1991).
Meliteniotes Th., '*Εἰς τὴν Σωφροσύνην* (*On Prudence*)', in *Notices et extraits de la Bibliothèque Nationale* 19, 2, ed. M.E. Miller (Paris, 1857), 1-138.
Merkelbach R., *Roman und Mysterium in der Antike* (München, 1962).

Merkle S., ‘Fable, Anecdote and Novella in the *Vita Aesopi*: The Ingredients of a ‘Popular Novel’’, in Pecere, Stramaglia (1996), 211-34. [= Merkle (1996a)]

——, ‘The Truth and Nothing but the Truth: Dictys and Dares’, in Schmeling (ed.) (1996), 563-80. [= Merkle (1996b)]

Messer W., *The Dream in Homer and Greek Tragedy* (New York, 1918).

Metlitzki D., *The Matter of Araby in Medieval England* (New Haven, 1977).

Metzger B.M., Murphy R.E., (edd.) *The New Oxford Annotated Bible* (New York, 1994).

Meuli K., ‘Herkunft und Wesen der Fabel. Ein Vortrag’, in *Karl Meuli. Gesammelte Schriften*, ed. Th. Gelzer, II (Basel/Stuttgart, 1975), 731-56. [first appeared in *Schweizerisches Archiv für Volkskunde* 50 (1954) 65-88]

Meynard B. de, Courteille P. de (transl.), *Mas'udi, Les Prairies d'Or* (Paris, 1965).

Michael W. F., *Das deutsche Drama der Reformationszeit* (Bern, 1984).

Migne J.-P. (ed.), *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca* (Turnhout, 1977).

Mignogna E., ‘Aesopus Bucolicus: Come si “mette in scena” un miracolo’, in Holzberg (ed.) (1992), 76-84.

——, ‘Carite ed Ilia: Sogni di sogni’, in *GCN* 7 (1996), 95-102.

Milazzo A.M., ‘Motivi bucolici e tecnica alessandrina in due ‘idilli’ di Niceta Eugeniano’, in *Studi di filologia bizantina III.* Quaderni del Siculorum Gymnasium, 15 (Catania, 1985), 97-114.

Miller P.A., *Lyric Texts and Consciousness: the birth of a genre from archaic Greece to Augustan Rome* (London/New York, 1994).

Miquel A., *Géographie arabe et répresentation du monde* (Paris, 1975).

Miralles C. (ed.) *Xenofont d'Efes, Efesíaques* (Barcelona, 1967).

——, ‘La tradizione giambica’, *QS* 15 (1989), 111-32.

Missotten G., ‘Kierkegaard et Don Juan: Le manuscrit infini (*Ou bien…ou bien…*) et le manuscrit imaginaire (*Les étapes érotiques spontanées*)’, in Herman, Hallyn (1999), 375-87.

Mitchell M., *Gone With the Wind* (New York, 1936).

Mohl M.J., *Le Livre des Rois d'Abou 'l-Karim Firdousi*, French translation from Persian, tome 5 (Paris, 1876).

Molinié G., *Chariton d'Aphrodise, Le roman de Chairéas et Callirhoé*, texte et trad. (Paris, 1979); 2d ed. rev. A. Billault (Paris, 1989).

Monat P., ‘Une forme de la *virtus* accessible aux femmes. La *Patientia* dans la *Consolation à Grégoria* d'Arnobe le Jeune’, in *Valeurs dans le stoïcisme. Du Portique à nos jours. Textes rassemblés en hommage à Michel Spanneut*, ed. M. Soetard (Lille, 1993), 105-11.

Montevecchi O., *La papirologia*. Ristampa riveduta e corretta con addenda (Milano, 1988).

Morales H.L., ‘The taming of the view: natural curiosities in *Leukippe and Kleitophon*’, in *GCN* 6 (1995), 39-50.

——, ‘A scopophiliac's paradise: vision and narrative in Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe & Clitophon*’, PhD thesis (Cambridge, 1997).

——, ‘Sense and sententiousness in the Greek novels’, in Sharrock, Morales (2000), 67-88.

Morgan J.R., Stoneman R. (edd.), *Greek Fiction. The Greek Novel in Context* (London/New York, 1994).

Morgan J.R., ‘History, Romance, and Realism in the *Aithiopika* of Heliodoros’, *Classical Antiquity* 1 (1982), 221-65.

——, ‘Lucian's *True Histories* and the *Wonders Beyond Thule* of Antonios Diogenes’, *CQ* 35 (1985), 475-90.

——, 'The Story of Cnemon in Heliodoros' *Aithiopika*', *JHS* 109 (1989), 99-113.
——, 'Make-believe and make believe: the fictionality of the Greek novels', in Gill, Wiseman (1993), 175-229.
——, '*Daphnis and Chloe*: Love's Own Sweet Story', in Morgan, Stoneman (1994), 64-79. [= Morgan (1994a)]
——, 'The *Aithiopika* of Heliodoros: Narrative as Riddle', in Morgan, Stoneman (1994), 97-113. [= Morgan (1994b)]
——, 'Heliodoros', in Schmeling (ed.) (1996), 417-56. [= Morgan (1996a)]
——, 'Erotika Mathemata: Greek Romance as Sentimental Education', in *Education in Greek Fiction*, edd. A.H. Sommerstein, C. Atherton. Nottingham Classical Literature Studies, 4 (Bari, 1996), 163-89. [= Morgan (1996b)]
——, 'On the Fringes of the Canon: Work on the Fragments of Ancient Greek Fiction 1936-1994', *ANRW* II.34.4 (1998), 3293-390.
——, '*The Story of Knemon in Heliodoros*' Aithiopika', in Swain (1999), 259-85.
——, *Longus. Daphnis and Chloe. Introduction, Translation and Commentary* (Warminster, 2003).
Morgan K., *Myth and Philosophy from the Presocratics to Plato* (Cambridge, 2000).
Morin G., *Études, Textes, Découvertes* (Paris, 1913).
Most G., 'The stranger's stratagem: self-disclosure and self-sufficiency in Greek culture', *JHS* 109 (1989), 114-33.
—— (ed.), *Commentaries/Kommentare*. Aporemata: Kritische Studien zur Philologiegeschichte, Band 4 (Göttingen, 1999).
Muchow M., *Passionate Love and Respectable Society in Three Greek Novels*. Unpubl. diss., Johns Hopkins University (Baltimore, 1988).
Mukařovský J., *Estetická funkce, norma a hodnota jajo sociální fakty* (Praha, 1936). Translation: Surino M.E., *Aesthetic function, norm and value as social facts* (Ann Arbor, 1979).
Müller C. (ed.), *Pseudo-Callisthenes*, edition of the Greek recensions α, β and γ with Latin translation (Paris, 1846).
Müller K. (ed.), *Petronius: Satyrica* (München, 1965).
Müller-Reineke H., *Liebesbeziehungen in Ovids Metamorphosen und ihr Einfluss auf den Roman des Apuleius* (Göttingen, 2000).
Munro J., *Mademoiselle de Scudéry and the Carte de Tendre* (Durham, 1986).
Murray A.T. (ed.), *Homer. The Odyssey*. With an English translation (Cambridge/London, 1919).
Musurillo H., *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs. Introduction, Text and Translations* (Oxford, 1972).
Nagel T., *Alexander der Grosse in der frühislamischen Volksliteratur* (Walldorf/Hessen, 1978).
Nagy G., 'Iambos: Typologies of Invective and Praise', *Arethusa* 9 (1976), 191-205.
——, *The best of the Achaeans. Concepts of the hero in archaic Greek poetry* (Baltimore/London, 1979).
Nau F., *Histoire et sagesse d'Ahikar l'Assyrien* (Paris, 1909).
New C., *Philosophy of literature: An Introduction* (London, 1999).
Newman F., *The Short Story's Mutations from Petronius to Paul Morand* (New York, 1924).
——, *The Hard-Boiled Virgin* (New York, 1926).
——, *Dead Lovers are Faithful Lovers* (New York, 1928).
Nicholson R.A., *A Literary History of the Arabs* (London, 1907).
Nilsson I., *Erotic Pathos, Rhetorical Pleasure. Narrative Technique and Mimesis in Eumathios Makrembolites' Hysmine & Hysminias* (Uppsala, 2001).

Nimis S., 'The Prosaics of the Ancient Novel', *Arethusa* 27.3 (1994), 387-411.

——, 'Memory and Description in the Ancient Novel', *Arethusa* 31.1 (1998), 99-122.

——, 'The Sense of Open-endedness in the Ancient Novel', *Arethusa* 32.2 (1999), 215-38.

——, 'Cycles and Sequences in Longus', in *Speaking Volumes: Orality and Literacy in the Greek and Roman World*, ed. J. Watson (Leiden, 2001), 187-200.

Nisbet R. G. M., Hubbard M., *A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book II* (Oxford, 1978).

Nöldeke Th., *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Alexanderromans* (Vienna, 1890).

Nolting-Hauff I., 'Märchenromane mit leidendem Helden', *Poetica* 6 (1974), 417-55.

Norris H.T., *Saharan Myth and Saga* (Oxford, 1972).

——, 'Qisas elements in the Qur'an', in Beeston et al. (1983), 252-9.

Nünlist R., *Poetologische Bildersprache in der frühgriechischen Dichtung* (Stuttgart/Leipzig, 1998).

Oettinger N., 'Achikars Weisheitssprüche im Lichte älterer Fabeldichtung', in Holzberg (ed.) (1992), 3-22.

O'Leary, De Lacy, *How Greek Science passed to the Arabs* (London, 1949).

Oliver J., *Greek Constitutions of the Early Roman Emperors from Inscriptions and Papyri* (Philadephia, 1989).

O'Sullivan J., 'Notes on the text and interpretation of Achilles Tatius 1', *CQ* 28 (1978), 312-29.

——, *A lexicon to Achilles Tatius* (Stuttgart, 1980).

——, *Xenophon of Ephesus. His Composition Technique, and the Birth of the Novel* (Berlin, 1995).

Otis B., *Ovid as an Epic Poet* (Cambridge, ^{2}1970).

Pabón P., '*Loca noxiorum poenis destinata* (Front., 55, 8-15 La) o el castigo fuera de la ciudad', *Athenaeum* 90 (2002), 147-59.

Palmer A., *The seventh century in the West-Syrian Chronicles* (Liverpool, 1993).

Panayotakis C., *Theatrical Elements in the Satyrica of Petronius* (Leiden, 1995).

Panayotakis N.M. (ed.), *Origini della letteratura neogreca.* Neograeca Medii Aevi, II (Venice, 1993).

Panayotakis S., 'The Temple and the Brothel: Mothers and Daughters in *Apollonius of Tyre*', in Paschalis, Frangoulidis (2002), 98-117.

——, *Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri: A Commentary* (forthcoming).

Pandiri T.A., 'Daphnis and Chloe: the Art of Pastoral Play', *Ramus* 14 (1985), 116-41.

Papademetriou J.-Th. A., *Aesop as an Archetypal Hero* (Athens, 1997).

Papaioannou S., 'Charite's rape, Psyche on the rock, and the parallel function of marriage in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*', *Mnemosyne* 51.3 (1998), 302-24.

Papanikolaou A.D. (ed.), *Xenophontis Ephesii Ephesiacorvm Libri V de amoribvs Anthiae et Abrokomae* (Leipzig, 1973).

Papathomopoulos M. (ed./transl.), Ὁ βίος τοῦ Αἰσώπου. Ἡ παραλλαγὴ G (Ioannina, ^{2}1991).

—— (ed./transl./ann.), Ὁ βίος τοῦ Αἰσώπου. Ἡ παραλλαγὴ W (Athens, 1999).

Paschalis M., Frangoulidis S., (edd.), *Space in the Ancient Novel* (Groningen, 2002).

Paschoud F., '*Mendacii splendor*: formes d'entrée en matière et protestations de véridicité dans la littérature de fiction', *Latomus* 54 (1995), 262-78.

Pasolini P. P., *Romanzi e racconti II 1962-1975*, edd. W. Siti, S. De Laude (Milano, 1998). (*editio princeps* Torino, 1992).

Paulsen T.: *Inszenierung des Schicksals. Tragödie und Komödie im Roman des Heliodor* (Trier, 1992). (Diss. Bochum, 1991).

Paumgartner B., *Mozart*. 2 vols. (Utrecht/Antwerpen, 1957). (Dutch translation; original ed. Zürich, 1945).

Pawis R. (ed.), *Johann Hartliebs 'Alexander'*. Münchener Texte und Untersuchungen zur deutschen Literatur des Mittelalters, 97 (München, 1991).

Pearcy L.T., 'Achilles Tatius, *Leucippe and Clitophon* 1.14-15: an unnoticed lacuna?', *CP* 73 (1978), 233-5.

Pease A.S., 'Notes on Stoning among the Greeks and Romans', *TAPA* 38 (1907), 5-18.

——, *Publi Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber IV* (Cambridge, 1935; repr. Darmstadt, 1967).

Pecere O., Stramaglia A. (edd.), *La Letteratura di Consumo nel Mondo Greco-Latino* (Cassino, 1996).

Pellizer E., 'Per una morfologia della poesia giambica arcaica', in *OINHPA TEYXH. Studi triestini di poesia conviviale*, edd. K. Fabian, E. Pellizer, G. Tedeschi (Alessandria, 1991), 15-29 [first appeared in *I canoni letterari. Storia e dinamica*, edd. G. Petronio, U. Schulz-Buschhaus (Trieste, 1981), 35-48]

Penwill J.L., 'Reflections on a "happy ending": the case of Cupid and Psyche', *Ramus* 27.2 (1998), 160-82.

Penzkofer G., *»L'art du mensonge«. Erzählen als barocke Lügenkunst in den Romanen von Mademoiselle de Scudéry* (Tübingen, 1998).

Pepe L., 'Sul Monumento Sepolcrale di Trimalchio', in *Sermo Milesius*, ed. L. Pepe (Perugia, 1987), 163-76. [originally published in *GIF* 10 (1957), 293-300]

Perkins J., *The Suffering Self. Pain and Narrative Representation in the Early Christian Era* (New York, 1995).

Pernot L., *La rhétorique de l'éloge dans le monde Gréco-romain, Tome I: Histoire et technique, Tome II: Les valeurs* (Paris, 1993).

Perry B.E., *Studies in the Text History of the Life and Fables of Aesop*. APA Monographs, 7, (Haverford, PA, 1936).

——, *Aesopica, I: Greek and Latin Texts* (Urbana, Ill., 1952, repr. New York, 1980).

——, *The Ancient Romances: A Literary-Historical Account of Their Origins* (Berkeley/Los Angeles, 1967).

Perusino F. (ed.), *Anonimo (Michele Psello?), La Tragedia Greca* (Urbino, 1993).

Pervo R., 'A Nihilist Fabula: Introducing The Life of Aesop', in Hock, Bradley Chance, Perkins (1998), 77-120.

Peters F.E., *Aristotle and the Arabs: the Aristotelian Tradition in Islam* (New York, 1968).

Petit L., 'Monodie de Nicétas Eugénianos sur Théodore Prodrome', *Vizantijskij Vremmenik* 9 (1902), 446-63.

Pezopoulos E.A., 'Νικήτας ὁ Εὐγενειανὸς ποιητὴς τῶν Ἐπιγραμμάτων τοῦ κώδικος Urbin.134', *Ἐπετηρὶς Ἑταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν* 12 (1936), 423-32.

Pfeiffer R., *History of Classical Scholarship* I (Oxford, 1986).

Pfister F., *Der Alexanderroman mit einer Auswahl aus den verwandten Texten*, German translation of Pseudo-Callisthenes A in W. Kroll's edition (Meisenheim am Glan, 1978), 1-81.

Pichard M. (ed.), *Le Roman de Callimaque et de Chrysorrhoé* (Paris, 1956).

Picket J.P. (ed.), *American Heritage Dictionary*, fourth edition (Boston/New York, 2000).

Picone M., Zimmermann B. (edd.), *Der antike Roman und seine mittelalterliche Rezeption* (Basel/Boston/Berlin, 1997).
Pignani A. (ed.), *Niceforo Basilace, Progimnasmi e Monodie* (Napoli, 1983).
Pilsworth C., 'Dating the *Gesta martyrum*: a manuscript-based approach', *Early Medieval Europe* 9 (2000), 309-324.
Plepelits K., 'Achilles Tatius', in Schmeling (ed.) (1996), 387-416.
Polignac F. de, 'L'image d'Alexandre dans la littérature arabe: l'orient face à l'hellénisme?', *Arabica* 29 (1982), 296-306.
Pomeau R. (ed., comm.), *Voltaire: Candide ou l'Optimisme*. Édition Critique (Paris, 1959).
Poque S., 'Des roses du printemps à la rose d'automne. La culture patristique d'Agrippa d'Aubigné', *REAug* 17 (1971), 155-69.
Porter J.I., 'The Seductions of Gorgias', *ClAnt* 12 (1993), 267-99.
Potter D., 'Martyrdom as Spectacle', in *Theater and Society in the Classical World*, ed. R. Scodel (Ann Arbor, 1993), 53-88.
Price S.F., 'The future of dreams: from Freud to Artemidorus', *P&P* 113 (1986), 3-37.
Puche López C., 'Notas de estilo a propósito de la *Historia Apollonii regis Tyri*', in *La Filologia Latina hoy. Actualización y perspectivas*, edd. A. Aldama et al. (Madrid, 1999), vol. 1, 237-45.
Race W.H., 'How Greek Poems Begin', in Dunn, Cole (1992), 13-38.
Rattenbury R., 'Chastity and Chastity Ordeals in the Ancient Greek Romances', *Proceedings of the Leeds Philosophical and Literary Society. Literature and History Section* 1 (1926), 59-71.
Rattenbury R.M., Lumb T.W., Maillon J., Héliodore, *Ethiopiques ou Théagène et Chariclée*, éd./trad. (Paris, 1960^2).
Reale G. (ed.), *Platone. Fedro* (Milano, 1998).
Reardon B.P., 'The Greek Novel', *Phoenix* 23 (1969), 291-309.
——, *Courants littéraires grecs des IIè et IIIè siècles après J.C.* (Paris, 1971).
—— (ed.), *Erotica Antiqua*. Acta of the International Conference on the Ancient Novel (Bangor, Wales, 1977).
——, 'Theme, structure and narrative in Chariton', *YCS* 27 (1982), 1-27.
—— (transl.), 'Chariton. Chaereas and Callirhoe', in *CAGN* (1989), 17-124.
—— (transl.), 'Lucian. A True Story', in *CAGN* (1989), 619-49. [= Reardon (1989a)]
——, *The Form of Greek Romance* (Princeton, 1991).
——, 'Achilles Tatius and ego-narrative', in Morgan, Stoneman (1994), 80-96.
Reeve M. (ed.), *Longus, Daphnis et Chloe* (Stuttgart/Leipzig, ^{3}1994).
Reinink G.J., *Das syrische Alexanderlied: die drei Rezensionen* (Louvain, 1983).
——, 'Pseudo-Methodios und die Legende vom römischen Endkaiser', in *The Use and Abuse of Eschatology in the Middle Ages*, edd. W. Verbeke, D. Verhelst, A. Welkenhuysen (Louvain, 1988), 82-111.
——, 'Pseudo-Methodius: a concept of history in despair to the rise of Islam', in Cameron, Conrad (1992), 149-88.
——, *Die syrische Apokalypse des Pseudo-Methodios* (Louvain, 1993).
Reinsch D.R., 'Historia ancilla litterarum? Zum literarischen Geschmack in der Komnenenzeit: Das Beispiel der Σύνοψις Χρονικὴ des Konstantinos Manasses' (Referat in Nikosia, Juni 2000, erscheint in *Etudes Balkaniques [Cahiers Pierre Belon]*).
Reynolds L.D. (ed.), *Texts and transmission: a survey of the Latin classics* (Oxford, 1983).

Richlin A.E. (ed.), *Pornography and Representation in Greece and Rome* (New York/Oxford, 1992).
——, 'Reading Ovid's Rapes', in Richlin (ed.) (1992), 158-79.
Riess W., 'Die historische Entwicklung der römischen Folter- und Hinrichtungspraxis in kulturvergleichende Perspektive', *Historia* 51 (2002), 206-26.
Rieu Ch., *Catalogus Codicum Orientalium Musei Britannici*, 2 (London, 1894).
Rizzo R., '*Virgineus Rubor*', *Pan* 14 (1991), 213-35.
Robert L., 'Dans l'amphithéâtre et dans les jardins de Néron. Une épigramme de Lucilius' *CRAI* 1968, 280-8 (repr. in *Opera Minora Selecta*, V, Amsterdam, 1989, 552-60).
——, *Le Martyre de Pionios Prêtre de Smyrne.* Edité, traduit et commenté par Louis Robert, mis au point et completé par G.W. Bowersock et C.P. Jones, avec une préface de Jeanne Robert et une traduction du texte vieux-slave préparée par André Vaillant (Washington D.C., 1994).
Roberts D.H., Dunn F.M., Fowler D.P. (edd.), *Classical Closure* (Princeton, 1997).
Robertson D.S., Vallette P. (edd.), *Apulée: Les Métamorphoses*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1940-45; reprinted 1956, 1965, 1971).
Robins W., 'Latin Literature's Greek Romance', *MD* 35 (1995), 207-15.
——, 'Romance and Renunciation at the Turn of the Fifth Century', *JECS* 8 (2000), 531-57.
Robinson O.F., *The Criminal Law of Ancient Rome* (Baltimore, Maryland, 1995).
Rohde E., *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer* (Leipzig, ^{1}1876, ^{3}1914, ^{4}1960; repr. Darmstadt 1974).
Rondorf-Schumucker D., 'Über Alexander und den 'redenden Baum' in der persischen Miniaturmalerei', in *Aus dem Osten des Alexanderreichs,* edd. J. Ozols, V. Thewalt (Köln, 1984).
Rorty A. O., 'A Speculative Note on Some Dramatic Elements in the *Theaetetus*', *Phronesis* 17 (1972), 227-38.
Rosen R.M., *Old Comedy ant the Iambographic Tradition* (Atlanta, 1988).
Rosenmeyer T.G., 'Ancient Literary Genres – A Mirage?', *Yearbook of Comparative and General Literature* 34 (1985), 74-84.
Rosenmeyer P., *Ancient epistolary fictions: the letter in Greek literature* (Cambridge, 2001).
Rosenthal F. (transl.), *Ibn Khaldun. The Muqaddimah* (Princeton, 1958).
——, *The Classical Heritage in Islam* (London, 1975).
Rousset J., *Leurs yeux se rencontrèrent. La scène de première vue dans le roman* (Paris, 1981).
——, *Narcisse romancier. Essai sur la première personne dans le roman* (Paris, 1986).
——, *Le lecteur intime. De Balzac au journal* (Paris, 1986b). [= Rousset (1986b)]
——, *Passages, échanges et transposition* (Paris, 1990).
Rudd N., 'Romantic Love in Classical Times', *Ramus* 10 (1981), 140-58.
Ruska J., *Untersuchungen über das Steinbuch des Aristoteles* (Heidelberg, 1911).
Russell D.A., Winterbottom M. (edd.), *Ancient Literary Criticism. The Principal Texts in New Translations* (Oxford, 1972).
Russell D.A., *Criticism in Antiquity* (London, 1981).
——, *Greek Declamation* (Cambridge/London/New York, 1983).
—— (ed.), *Antonine Literature* (Oxford, 1990).
Ryan W.F., Schmitt C.B., *Pseudo-Aristotle, The Secret of Secrets: sources and influences* (London, 1982).

Rydén L., 'The Bride-Shows at the Byzantine Court – History or Fiction?', *Eranos* (1985), 175-91.

Sachs C., *Geschiedenis der Muziek* (Utrecht/Antwerpen, 1959).

Saïd S., 'La société rurale dans le roman grec, ou la campagne vue de la ville', in *Sociétés urbaines, sociétés rurales dans l'Asie Mineure et la Syrie hellénistiques et romaines*, ed. E. Frézouls (Strasbourg, 1987), 149-71; translated as 'Rural Society in the Greek Novel, or The Country Seen from the Town', in Swain (1999), 83-107.

——, 'The City in the Greek Novel', in Tatum (1994), 216-36.

Salles B., '*assem para et accipe auream fabulam*', *Latomus* 40 (1981), 3-20.

Samir, Samir Khalil, 'Les versions arabes chretiens du Roman d'Alexandre', in Finazzi, Valvo (1998), 227-47.

Sandy G.N., 'Ancient Prose Fiction and Minor Early English Novels', *A&A* 25 (1979), 41-55.

——, *Heliodorus* (Boston, 1982).

——, 'Iamblichus. A Babylonian Story', in *CAGN* (1989), 783-97.

——, 'Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* and the Ancient Novel', *ANRW* II 34.2 (1994), 1511-74.

——, 'The Heritage of the Ancient Greek Novel in France and Britain', in Schmeling (ed.) (1996), 735-73.

——, *The Greek World of Apuleius* (Leiden, 1997)

Scarcella A.M., *La Lesbo di Longo Sofista* (Rome, 1968); reprinted in Liviabella Furiani, Rossetti (1993), 285-312.

——, 'La tecnica dell'imitazione in Longo', in Liviabella Furiani, Rossetti (1993), II, 259-83. [first appeared in *GIF* 23 (1971), 34-59]

Schauer M., Merkle S., 'Äsop und Sokrates', in Holzberg (ed.) (1992), 85-96.

Schlam C.C., 'Platonica in the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius', *TAPA* 101 (1970), 477-87.

Schlam C. (†), Finkelpearl E., 'A Review of Scholarship on Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* 1971-1998', *Lustrum* 42 (2000).

Schmeling G., *Chariton* (New York, 1974).

—— (ed.), *Historia Apollonii Regis Tyrii* (Leipzig, 1988).

——, 'The "Satyricon": The Sense of an Ending', *RhM* 34 (1991), 352-77.

—— (ed.), *The Novel in the Ancient World* (Leiden/New York/Köln, 1996).

——, '*Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri*', in Schmeling (ed.) (1996), 517-51. [= Schmeling (1996a)]

——, 'Genre and the "Satyrica"', in *Satura lanx. Festschrift für Werner A. Krenkel*, ed. C. Klodt (Hildesheim, 1996), 105-17. [= Schmeling (1996b)]

——, '*Apollonius of Tyre*: Last of the Troublesome Latin Novels', *ANRW* II 34.4 (1998), 3270-91.

Schmitz T., *Bildung und Macht : zur sozialen und politischen Funktion der zweiten Sophistik in der griechischen Welt der Kaiserzeit*. Zetemata, 97 (München, 1997).

Schulz-Flügel E. (ed.), *Tyrannius Rufinus. Historia Monachorum sive de vita Sanctorum Patrum* (Berlin/New York, 1990).

Scioli E., 'The narrative function of Charite's dreams in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*', oral presentation, American Philological Association meetings (Dallas, 1999).

Scobie A., *Aspects of the Ancient Romance and its Heritage. Essays on Apuleius, Petronius, and the Greek Romances* (Meisenheim am Glan, 1969).

——, *Apuleius and Folklore* (London, 1983).

Scott K., 'The Significance of Statues in Precious Metals', *TAPA* 62 (1931), 101-23.

——, 'Ruler Cult and Related Problems in Greek Romances', *CPh* 33 (1938), 380-9.
Scotti M.T., 'Il proemio delle *Metamorfosi* tra Ovidio ed Apuleio', *GIF* 34 (1982), 43-65.
Seaton R.C., *Apollonius Rhodius. Argonautica. With an English translation* (Cambridge/London, 1912).
Segal G., 'Tragic Beginnings: Narration, Voice and Authority in the Prologues of Greek Drama', in Dunn, Cole (1992), 85-112.
Seidel K., *The Southern Belle in the American Novel* (Tampa, 1985).
Selden D.L., 'Genre of Genre', in Tatum (1994), 39-64.
Serpieri A., *Retorica e immaginario* (Parma, 1986).
Sgard J., *Prévost romancier* (Paris, 1968).
——, *Le "Pour et contre" de Prévost.* Introduction, tables et index (Paris, 1969).
——, *Le Roman français à l'âge classique, 1600-1800* (Paris, 2000).
Sharrock A., Morales H.L. (edd.), *Intratextuality: Greek and Roman textual relations* (Oxford, 2000).
Silk M.S., 'Pindar meets Plato: Theory, Style and the Classics', in *Texts, Ideas and the Classics: Scholarship and Theory in Classical Literature,* ed. S.J. Harrison (Oxford, 2001), 26-45.
Simpson D.C., 'The Book of Tobit', in *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament,* ed. R. H. Charles et al. (Oxford 1913, repr. 1963), I, 174-241.
Simpson M. (transl./ann.), *Gods and Heroes of the Greeks. The Library of Apollodorus* (Amherst, Mass., 1976).
Sissa G., *Greek Virginity* (Cambridge, Mass., 1990).
Skutsch O., *The Annals of Quintus Ennius* (Oxford, 1985).
Slater N., 'Passion and Petrifaction: The Gaze in Apuleius', *CPh* 93 (1998), 18-48.
Smith O. L. †, *The Byzantine Achilleid. The Naples Version* (Vienna, 1999).
Smith R.A., *Poetic Allusion and Poetic Embrace in Ovid and Virgil* (Ann Arbor, 1997).
Smith W.S., 'Cupid and Psyche Tale: Mirror of the Novel', in *AAGA* 2 (1998), 69-82.
Smith W.S., Woods J.B. Jr., 'Platonism in Apuleius' Tale of Aristomenes', abstract, in Zimmerman, Panayotakis, Keulen (2000), 111-12. Forthcoming as 'Tale of Aristomenes: Declamation in a Platonic Mode', *AN* 2 (Groningen, 2003).
Sorel C., *La Bibliothèque françoise* (1664), repr. of the 2nd ed. Paris 1667 (Genève, 1970).
——, *De la connoissance des bons livres* (1671), ed. L. Moretti Cenerini (Roma, 1974).
Southgate M.S., *Iskandarnamah. A Persian medieval Alexander romance* (New York, 1978).
Soverini P., 'Il problema delle teorie retoriche e poetiche di Petronio', *ANRW* II.32.3 (1985), 1706-79.
Spadaro G., 'Problemi I', in *Ἑλληνικά* 28 (1975), 302-27.
Speyer W., 'Religiöse Pseudepigraphie und literarische Fälschung im Altertum', *JAC* 8-9 (1965-6), 88-125.
——, *Bücherfunde in der Glaubenswerbung der Antike.* Hypomnemata, 24 (Göttingen, 1970).
——, *Die literarische Fälschung im heidnischen und christlichen Altertum: Ein Versuch ihrer Deutung* (München, 1971).
Spitaler A., 'Die arabische Fassung des Trostbriefs Alexanders an seine Mutter. Ein beitrag zur Überlieferung des arabischen Alexanderromans', in *Studi Orientalistici in onore di G. Levi della Vida*. vol. 2 (Roma, 1956), 493-508.

Stanford W. B. (ed.), *Sophocles' Ajax* (London, 1963).
Stephens S., 'Popularity of the Ancient Novel', in Tatum, Vernazza (1990), 148-9.
Stephens S., Winkler J. (edd.), *Ancient Greek Novels: the Fragments. Introduction, Text, Translation and Commentary* (Princeton, 1995).
Stewart R. (ed.), *Sortes Astrampsychi*. Vol. 2 (München/Leipzig, ^{2}2001).
Stoneman R., *The Greek Alexander Romance*, translation based on Pseudo-Callisthenes L with additions from γ (London, 1991).
——, 'Oriental motifs in the Alexander Romance', *Antichthon* 26 (1992), 95-113.
——, 'Jewish Traditions on Alexander the Great', *Studia Philonica Annual* 6 (1994), 37-53 [= Stoneman (1994a)]
——, 'Romantic Ethnography', *Ancient World* 25 (1994), 93-107. [= Stoneman (1994b)]
——, 'Riddles in Bronze and Stone: Monuments and their Interpretation in the *Alexander Romance*', in *GCN* 6 (1995), 159-70.
——, 'The Metamorphoses of the Alexander Romance' in Schmeling (ed.) (1996), 601-12.
——, 'The Medieval Alexander', in Hofmann (1999), 238-52.
Stowers S.K., *Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity* (Philadelphia, 1986).
Stramaglia A., 'Due storie di fantasmi raccontate da fantasmi? PMich inv. 3378 (Pack^{2} 2629) e Apuleio, *Met.* IX, 29-31', *ZPE* 84 (1990), 19-26.
——, 'Innamoramento in sogno o storia di fantasmi? PMich inv. 5 = PGM^{2} XXXIV (Pack^{2} 2636) + PPalauRib inv. 152', *ZPE* 88 (1991), 73-86.
——, 'Prosimetria narrativa e 'romanzo perduto': PTurner 8 (con discussione e riedizione di PSI 151 [Pack^{2} 2624] + PMilVogliano 260)', *ZPE* 92 (1992), 121-49. [= Stramaglia (1992a)]
——, 'Covi di banditi e cadaveri "scomodi" in Lolliano, Apuleio e [Luciano]', *ZPE* 94 (1992), 59-63. [= Stramaglia (1992b)]
——, 'Sul frammento di romanzo (?) Pmichael 4 (Pack ^{2}2271)', *ZPE* 10, 1 (1993), 75-7.
——, 'Fra "consumo" e "impegno": usi didattici della narrativa nel mondo antico', in Pecere, Stramaglia (1996), 99-166.
——, 'Il soprannaturale nella narrativa greco-latina: testimonianze papirologiche', in *GCN* 9 (1998), 29-60.
——, *Res inauditae, incredulae. Storie di fantasmi nel mondo greco-latino* (Bari, 1999).
Strohmaier G., 'Hunain ibn Ishaq: an Arab scholar translating into Syriac', *ARAM* 3 (1991), 163-70.
Stuplich B., *Zur Dramentechnik des Hans Sachs*. Arbeiten und Editionen zur Mittleren Deutschen Literatur. Neue Folge, 5 (Stuttgart/Bad Cannstatt, 1998).
Sturm H. (ed.), *Libro de los Buenos proverbios: a critical edition* (Lawrence, 1970).
Suermann H., *Die geschichtliche Reaktion auf die einfallende Muslime in der edessenischen Apokalyptik des 7. Jahrhunderts* (Frankfurt, 1985).
Swain S.C.R., *Hellenism and Empire* (Oxford, 1996).
—— (ed.), *Oxford Readings in the Greek Novel* (Oxford, 1999).
Swan C., Hooper W. (edd.), *Gesta Romanorum* (London/New York, 1876-1959).
Syme R., *Tacitus* (Oxford, 1957).
Tabacco R., 'Povertà e richezza: L'unità tematica della declamazione XIII dello Pseudo-Quintiliano', *MCSN II* (1978), 37-70.
——, 'L'utilizzazione dei topoi nella declamazione XIII dello Pseudo-Quintiliano', *AAT* 112 (1978), 197-224. [= Tabacco (1978a)]

——, ‘*Apes Pauperis* Ps.-Quint.: Articolazione tematica ed equilibri strutturali’, *AAP* 28 (1979), 81-104.

Tabari, *The History of al-Tabari*, vol. 4: *The Ancient Kingdoms*, transl. Moshe Perlmann (Albany, 1987).

Tackaberry W. H., *Lucian’s Relation to Plato and the Post-Aristotelian Philosophers*. Univ. of Toronto Studies, 9 (Toronto, 1930).

Tatum J., ‘The tales in Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses*’, *TAPA* 100 (1969), 487-527.

——, *Apuleius and The Golden Ass* (Ithaca/London, 1979).

—— (ed.), *The Search for the Ancient Novel* (Baltimore, 1994).

Tatum J., Vernazza G.M. (edd.), *The Ancient Novel. Classical Paradigms and Modern Perspectives. ICAN TWO, Proceedings of the International Conference on the Ancient Novel, Hanover, New Hampshire July 23-29, 1989* (Hanover, New Hampshire, 1990).

Teodorsson S. T., *A commentary on Plutarch’s Table talks, Vol. I., Books 1-3* (Göteborg, 1989).

Thesleff H., *Studies in Platonic Chronology*. Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum, 70 (Helsinki, 1982).

Thielmann Ph., *Über Sprache und Kritik des lateinischen Apolloniusromanes* (Speier, 1881).

Thomas C.M., ‘Stories Without Texts and Without Authors: The Problem of Fluidity in Ancient Novelistic Texts and Early Christian Literature’, in Hock, Bradley Chance, Perkins (1998), 273-91.

Thompson S., *Motif Index of Folk-Literature*. 6 vols. (Copenhagen/Bloomington, 1955-58).

——, *The Types of the Folktale* (Helsinki, ^{2}1961).

Thomson R.W. (transl.), *Sebeos, The Armenian History attributed to Sebeos* (Liverpool, 1999).

Thornley G., Edmonds J.M. (edd.), *Longus, Daphnis and Chloe, with the English translation of G. T. revised and augmented by J.M.E.; The Love Romances of Parthenius and Other Fragments, with an English translation by S. Gaselee* (Cambridge, Mass./London, 1916).

Tilkin F., ‘Le topos du manuscrit trouvé dans les contes de Voltaire’, in Herman, Hallyn (1999), 183-91.

Todorov T., *Littérature et signification* (Paris, 1986).

Too Y.L., ‘Losing the Author’s Voice: Cultural and Personal Identities in the *Metamorphoses* Prologue’, in Kahane, Laird (2001), 177-87.

Trapp E. (ed.), *Digenes Akrites, synoptische Ausgabe der ältesten Versionen* (Vienna, 1971).

Trapp M., ‘Plato’s *Phaedrus* in Second-Century Greek Literature’, in Russell (1990), 141-73.

Treu K., *Der Realitätsgehalt des antiken Romans*, in Kuch (1989), 107-25.

Trumpf J., *Vita Alexandri Regis Macedonum*, edition of Pseudo-Callistenes φ (Stuttgart, 1974).

Trypanis C.A., *Greek Poetry from Homer to Seferis* (London, 1981).

Tschemplik A., ‘Framing the Question of Knowledge: Beginning Plato’s *Theaetetus*’, in *Plato’s Dialogues. New Studies and Interpretations*, ed. G. Press (London, 1993), 169-78.

Tsitsikli D., *Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri* (Königstein/Ts., 1981).

Turner P., ‘Novels, Ancient and Modern’, *Novel* 2 (1968-69), 15-24.

Van Bekkum W.J., *A Hebrew Alexander Romance according to MS London, Jews’ College, no. 145* (Louvain, 1992).

——, *A Hebrew Alexander Romance according to Ms. Héb. 671.5 Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale*, edition and translation of the Hebrew *Historia de Preliis* I^2 (Groningen, 1994).
——, 'A Short Note on Ancient Jewish Narrative', *AN* 1 (Groningen, 2002), 379-81.
Van der Paardt R., *L. Apuleius Madaurensis, The Metamorphoses: A Commentary on Book III* (Amsterdam, 1971).
——, 'The story of Mr. 'Overbold' as '*specimen historiae*' (on Apul. *Met*. viii.1-14)', in *Symposium Apuleianum Groninganum*, edd. B.L. Hijmans, V. Schmidt (Groningen, 1980), 19-28.
——, 'Meleager Asinus: A Complex Mythological Allusion (Apul. *Met*. VII 28)', in *Ad Litteras*, edd. A.P. Orban, M.G.M. Van der Poel, (Nijmegen, 2001), 217-27.
Van der Stockt L., *Twinkling and twilight. Plutarch's reflections on literature.* Verhandelingen van de Koninklijke Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone kunsten van België. Klasse der Letteren, jaargang 54, nr. 145 (Brussel, 1992).
Van Dijk G.J., 'The Function of Fables in Graeco-Roman Romance', *Mnemosyne* 49 (1996), 513-41.
——, *ΑΙΝΟΙ, ΛΟΓΟΙ, ΜΥΘΟΙ: Fables in Archaic, Classical and Hellenistic Greek Literature* (Leiden/New York/Köln, 1997).
Van Dijk J.J.A., 'Die Inschriftenfunde', *Abhandlungen der Deutschen Orientgesellschaft* 7 (Berlin, 1962), 39-62.
Van Leeuwen P.J., *De maleische Alexanderroman* (Meppel, 1937).
Van Mal-Maeder D.K., *Apulée. Les Métamorphoses. Livre II: Introduction, texte, traduction et commentaire* (Groningen, 2001). [=*GCA* (2001)]
——, 'Déclamations et romans. La double vie des personnages romanesques: le père, le fils et la marâtre assassine', in *Les personnages du roman grec*, ed. B. Pouderon (Lyon, 2001b), 59-72. [= Van Mal-Maeder (2001)]
——, '*Quicquid rationem uincit affectus est*: rationnel et irrationnel dans les déclamations latines', in *En deçà et au-delà de la ratio* (Lille, à paraître).
Van Thiel H., *Leben und Taten Alexanders von Makedonien. Der Griechische Alexanderroman nach der Handschrift L*, edition and German translation (Darmstadt, 1983).
Van Uytfanghe M., 'L'hagiographie: Un 'genre' chrétien ou antique tardif?', *AB* 111 (1993), 135-88.
Verdenius W. J., 'Gorgias' doctrine of deception', in *The Sophists and their Legacy*, ed. G.B. Kerferd (Wiesbaden, 1981), 116-28.
Vermeule E., *Aspects of Death in Early Greek Art and Poetry* (Berkeley, 1979).
Vernant J.-P., Zeitlin F. I. (edd.), *Mortals and Immortals: Collected Essays* (Princeton, 1991).
Vernant J.-P., 'From the 'Presentification' of the Invisible to the Imitation of Appearance', in Vernant, Zeitlin (1991), 151-63. [= Vernant (1991a)]
——, 'The Birth of Images', in Vernant, Zeitlin (1991), 164-85. [= Vernant (1991b)]
Versini L., *Le roman épistolaire* (Paris, 1979).
Vieillefond J.-R. (ed.), *Longus. Pastorales (Daphnis et Chloé)* (Paris, 1987).
Vilborg E. (ed.), *Achilles Tatius. Leucippe and Clitophon*. Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia, 1 (Stockholm, 1955).
Von Grunebaum G.E., *Medieval Islam: a study in cultural orientalism* (Chicago, 1953).
Von Keller A., Goetze E. (edd.), *Hans Sachs*. 26 vols. (Hildesheim/New York, 1964).

Von Koppenfels W., 'Mundus alter et idem. Utopiefiktion und menippeische Satyre', *Poetica* 13 (1981), 16-67.

Von Kremer A., *Über die südarabische Sage* (Leipzig, 1866).

Von Möllendorff P., 'Die Fabel vom Adler und Mistkäfer im Äsoproman', *RhM* 137 (1994), 141-61.

Walbridge J., *The Leaven of the Ancients* (Albany, 1999).

Waldner K., 'Zur Öffentlichkeit gewaltsamer Bestrafung in griechischen Romanen und frühchristlichen Martyriumsberichten', in Zimmerman, Panayotakis, Keulen (2000), 114-16.

Waldron A., *The Great Wall of China* (Cambridge, 1990).

Wallis Budge E.A., *The History of Alexander the Great, being the Syriac version of Pseudo-Callisthenes* (Cambridge/London, 1889, repr. Amsterdam, 1976).

——, *Life and Exploits of Alexander the Great being a Series of Translations of the Ethiopic Histories of Alexander by Pseudo-Callisthenes and other Writers* (Cambridge, 1896).

Walsh P.G., *The Roman Novel* (Cambridge, 1970).

——, 'Was Petronius A Moralist?', *G & R* 21 (1974), 181-90.

Walz Ch. (ed.), *Ἑρμογένους περὶ μεθόδου δεινότητος ... Κορινθίου κυρίου Γρηγορίου σχόλια* = Rhetores Graeci 7.2 (Stuttgart/Tübingen, 1832-36, Nachdruck Osnabrück, 1968), 1090-1352.

Waszink J.H. (ed.), *Quinti Septimi Florentis Tertulliani De anima* (Amsterdam, 1947).

——, '*Biothanati*', *RAC* 2 (1954), 391-4.

Watson A., *The Trial of Stephen: The First Christian Martyr* (Athens, Georgia/London, 1996).

Watson G., *Phantasia in Classical Thought* (Galway, 1988).

——, 'The Concept of 'Phantasia' from the Late Hellenistic Period to Early Neoplatonism', *ANRW* II.36.7 (1994), 4766-4810.

Watson P. A., *Ancient Stepmothers. Myth, Misogyny and Reality* (Leiden, 1995).

Waugh E. H., 'Alexander in Islam: the sacred persona in Muslim rulership *adab*', in *Subject and Ruler: the cult of the ruling power in classical antiquity. JRA* Suppl., 17, ed. A. Small, (Ann Arbor, 1996), 237-63.

Weiderhorn M., 'The anxiety dream in literature from Homer to Milton', *SPh* 46 (1967), 65-82.

Wellek R., *A History of Modern Criticism 1750-1950: VII German, Russian and Eastern European Criticism* (New Haven, 1991).

Wendel K., *Scholia in Theocritum vetera* (Leipzig, 1914).

West M.L., *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus* (Berlin/New York, 1974).

——, 'The Ascription of Fables to Aesop in Archaic and Classical Greece', in Adrados, Reverdin (1984), 105-28.

——, *Iambi et Elegi Graeci*, I. (Oxford, [2]1989).

——, *Greek Lyric Poetry* (Oxford, 1993).

West S., 'Herodotus' Epigraphical Interests', *CQ* 35 (1985), 278-305.

Westerbrink A.G., 'Some Parodies in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*', in *AAGA* (1978), 63-74.

Weymann K.F., *Die aetiopische und arabische Übersetzung des Pseudocallisthenes. Eine literarkritische Untersuchung.* Diss. Heidelberg (Kirchhain, 1901).

Whitby M., 'Greek historical writing after Procopius: Variety and Vitality', in Cameron, Conrad (1992), 25-80.

Whitmarsh T.J.G., 'The birth of a prodigy: Heliodorus and the genealogy of Hellenism', in Hunter (1998), 93-124.

——, *Greek literature and the Roman empire: the politics of imitation* (Oxford, 2001).
—— (transl. & notes), *Achilles Tatius, Leucippe & Clitophon*. Introduction by Helen Morales (Oxford, 2002).
Wickham E.C. (ed.), *Q. Horati Flacci opera* (Oxford, 1900).
Williamson M., 'The Greek Romance', in *The Progress of Romance: the Politics of Popular Fiction*, ed. J. Radford (London, 1986), 23-45.
Wills L.M., 'The Jewish Novellas', in Morgan, Stoneman (1994), 223-38.
——, *The Jewish Novel in the Ancient World* (Ithaca, 1995).
——, *The Quest of the Historical Gospel: Mark, John, and the origins of the gospel genre* (London/New York, 1997).
Wilson C.E., 'The wall of Alexander against Gog and Magog: and the expedition sent out to find it by the Khalif Wathiq in 842 AD', *Asia Major*, introductory volume (1922), 575-612.
Wilson Nightingale A., *Genres in Dialogue: Plato and the Construct of Philosophy* (Cambridge, 1995).
Winkler J.J., 'The Mendacity of Kalasiris and the Narrative Strategy of Heliodoros' *Aithiopika*', *YCS* 27 (1982), 93-158; reprinted in Swain (1999), 286-350.
——, *Auctor & Actor. A Narratological Reading of Apuleius's Golden Ass* (Berkeley/Los Angeles, 1985).
—— (transl.), 'Achilles Tatius. Leucippe and Cleitophon', in *CAGN* (1989), 170-284.
Winterbottom M., *Roman Declamation. Extracts edited with commentary* (Bristol, 1980).
Witakowski W., *The Syriac Chronicle of Pseudo-Dionysius of Tell-Mahre. A study in the history of Historiography* (Uppsala, 1987).
Wolff S., *The Greek Romance in Elizabethan Prose Fiction* (New York, 1912).
Wolohojian A.M., *The Romance of Alexander the Great by Pseudo-Callisthenes*, translation from Armenian (New York/London, 1969).
Wouters A., 'The εἰκόνες in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe* IV 39, 2: "Beglaubigungsapparat"?', *SEJG* 31 (1989-90), 465-79.
Wright J., 'Disintegrated Assurances: The Contemporary American Response to the *Satyricon*', *G & R* 23 (1976), 32-9.
Wright M.R., *Empedocles: The Extant Fragments* (London, ^{2}1995).
Wright W., *Short History of Syriac Literature* (London, 1894).
Wyke M., 'Make Like Nero', in *Reflections of Nero*, edd. J. Elsner, J. Masters (London, 1994), 12-28.
Young M.J.L., Latham J.D., Serjeant, R.B. (edd.), *The Cambridge History of Arabic Literature: Religion Learning and Science in the 'Abbasid Period'* (Cambridge, 1990).
Young S., *So Red the Rose* (New York, 1934).
Zanetto G., 'Iambic Patterns in Aristophanic Comedy', in *Iambic Ideas. Essays on a Poetic Tradition from Archaic Greece to the Late Roman Empire*, edd. A. Aloni, A. Cavarzere, A. Barchiesi (Lanham, 2001), 65-76.
Zeitlin F., 'The Poetics of Eros: Nature, Art, and Imitation in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*', in Halperin, Winkler, Zeitlin (1990), 148-70.
Ziegler R., 'Die *Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri* und der Kaiserkult in Tarsos', *Chiron* 14 (1984), 219-34.
Zimmerman M., *Apuleius Madaurensis. Metamorphoses Book X. Text, Introduction and Commentary* (Groningen, 2000). [= *GCA* (2000)]

Zimmerman M., Panayotakis S., Keulen W.H. (edd.), *The Ancient Novel in Context*. Abstracts of the Papers to be Read at the Third International Conference on the Ancient Novel to be held at the University of Groningen, The Netherlands 25-30 July 2000 (Groningen, 2000).

Zimmerman M. et al., *Apuleius Madaurensis, Metamorphoses, Books IV,28-35, V, and VI,1-24: Text, Introduction and Commentary* (Groningen, 2003). [= *GCA* (2003)]

Zimmermann B., 'Die Symphonie der Texte. Zur Intertextualität im griechischen Liebesroman', in Picone, Zimmermann (1997), 3-13.

This page intentionally left blank

INDEX

Achilles Tatius, 134, 172, 191-205, 273, 280, 318, 326, 439
adultery mime, 219
Aesop Romance, 37-51, 297
dramatised by Hans Sachs, 398
Agapitos, P., 360
Ahiquar Romance, 53-70
Alexander Romance, 3-21, 23-35, 289, 297
dramatised by Hans Sachs, 396
allegory, 405
amatory instruction, 320, 324
Ancona, R., 331
Andronicus Palaeologus, 389
anesis, 117
animal fables
in iambic poetry, 324
Antonius Diogenes
Wonders beyond Thule, 289, 297, 303
Apollonius of Tyre, 143-157, 289, 292, 309
in *Meisterlied* by Hans Sachs, 399
Apollonius Rhodius
Argonautica, 212
apotropaic spells, 222
Apuleius
Metamorphoses, 37-51, 68, 85-100, 161-170, 207-218, 219-238, 239-254, 347, 345-355
The Prologue, 48, 125
Risus festival, 352
Metamorphoses in Meisterlied by Hans Sachs, 399
Arabic narratives
about Alexander, 10
Arbasino, A., 422
Archilochus
Cologne Epode, 319
fragments, 324
Aristotle, 378
and Alexander, 16, 19
asceticism, 140
Asclepius, 168 f., 310
Astrampsychos, 304
audience
education of - by *Meistersinger*, 395
horizon of expectation, 379
of ancient Greek novel, 381
of Byzantine novels, 379
authentication, 289, 297, 301-314
author
hidden, 170, 172, 175, 178, 187, 192
Bakhtin, M.M., 416
Barlaam and Joasaph, 382
Bartsch, S., 86
beauty
and divinity, 78
blushing, 154
Bretzner, C.F.
libretto *Entführung aus dem Serail*, 384
Brown, P., 135
burning alive, 146
Byzantine novel
vernacular romances, 382
Callimachus, 333
Callimachus and Chrysorrhoe, 385
date of composition, 390
Calpurnius
Eclogues, 86
Calvino, I.
If on a Winter's Night a Traveller, 417
Carte de Tendre, 405
Cary, G., 23
Cash, W., 434
castles
in late-Byzantine fiction, 382
character-bound narration. See narrative, first person
characterization, 161, 396, 425, 437, 441
Chariton, 71-83, 173, 215, 258, 275, 279, 287
Plangon in -, 435
chastity, 133
chronotope
of casual encounters, 414
Cicero
On Divination, 165
closure
negation of -, 417
Conte, G. B., 172, 192, 213, 256, 263, 345
countryside
opposed to city, 176, 179
crowds, 147, 151

Cupane, C., 382
curiositas, 243
Dares, 298
De Forest, J.W.
The Bloody Chasm, 436
declamationes, 345-355
Degani, E., 327
deus ex machina, 384, 410
Dictys, 298, 304
dramatised by Hans Sachs, 396
Digenis Akritas, 383
Doufikar-Aerts, F., 13
dreaming
and fiction, 107
dreams, 74, 227, 377
Eco, U., 302
The Name of the Rose, 306
L'isola del giorno prima, 401-412
education
in the Byzantine empire, 357
Egger, B., 263, 432
elegy (Roman), 333
Elsom, H., 440
Empedocles, 163 f.
escapism, 431
Eugenianos, 361
self-criticism of -, 368
Euripides
Alcestis, 223
Hecuba, 377
Eusthatius Macrembolites
Hysmine & Hysminias, 298, 371-380
fables
in Aristophanes, 325
See also animal fables
'fatal charades', 87, 248
Faulkner, W.
Sanctuary, 441
The Unvanquished, 435
feminist reading, 440
See also literary criticism
Fetterley, J., 330
Finkelpearl, E., 169, 207
Floris and Blancheflor, 389
Fortune
as a figure of the author, 260
in Achilles Tatius, 197
in Apuleius' *Met.*, 348
in Chariton, 197, 260
Frye, N., 431
Fusillo, M., 411
gaze and viewing, 86
genre-experiments
in Byzantine literature, 358
ghost terminology, 226
Gigante, M., 379
Gilgamesh, 310
Gog and Magog, 4, 7
Gorgias
'doctrine of deception', 105, 162
theory on physicality of speech, 163
Greek myth
and Apuleius, 97
Grignaschi, M., 17
Hägg, T., 194
Harrison, S. J., 208
Heliodorus, 224, 274, 295, 401-412
theatrical imagery, 410
Herodotus, 289
Hesiod, 325
Hesse, H.
Der Steppenwolf, 302
Hipponax, 324
Holzberg, N., 61
Homer
Iliad, 228
Odyssey, 200, 209 f., 215 f., 262
Horace
Epistles, 214
Odes, 331
Satires, 224, 332
Hubbard, M., 336
Huet, P.-D., 402
Hunayn ibn Ishaq, 16
iambos (archaic)
and Greek novel, 317-328
Iamblichus
Babyloniaca, 297
Ibn al-Nadim, 15
Ibn Khaldun, 18
iconography
of Alexander, 8
imagery
initiation, 194
juggling, 167
theatrical, 410
words as weapons, 166
See also metaphor
imitatio cum variatione, 323
incipit
absence of -, 419
of Greek novels, 421
inscriptions
in Greek and Roman novel, 289-300
intertextuality
in chapter titles (Eco), 402
intertextual signals, 414
Isis, 169
and the invention of writing, 41
Kennedy, J.P.
Swallow Barn, 427
Kierkegaard, S., 302

Komnenian renaissance, 372, 381
Konstan, D., 266
Lasserre, F., 324
'Last Days of Alexander', 6, 23-35
letters
 in Greek novels, 271-287
liar paradox, 124
Liber ad Gregoriam, 155
Life of Aesop
 and Ahiqar, 60
light and darkness
 symbolism of, 57, 64
literary criticism
 ancient, 346
 feminist, 330
 in Eugenianos' novel, 366
literary texture
 of Apuleius' novel, 215, 241, 246, 354
 of Greek novels, 328, 411
locus amoenus, 383
Longus, 171-189, 258, 264, 309 f., 323, 437
Lucian
 Alexander, 169
 Halcyon, 162
 Lover of Lies, 162, 165
 Philosophies for Sale, 122
 The Fisherman, 420
 True Histories, 115-127, 171, 289, 419
 Zeus the Tragedian, 420
Ps. Lucian
 Dialogue on Love, 203
MacMullen, R., 432
Makrembolites, 361
Marcus Aurelius
 Meditations, 200
marriage
 in Apuleius' *Met.*, 220, 235
Martyr Accounts, 129-141
Mason, H.J., 37
McGlathery, D., 342
Meistersinger, 394
Meliteniotes, 382
Menippea, 416
metaphor, 403, 410
 sexual, 137
See also imagery
metapoiêsis, 200
Meuli, K., 325
Miralles, C., 317
mise en abyme, 251, 409
Mitchell, M.
 Gone with the Wind, 427
'mortar moments'
 in the ancient novels, 256
motifs
 abduction, 232, 385 f.
 hybris, 62, 66
 journeys, 215
 parodied by Apuleius, 237
 pirates, 180, 215
 robbers, 249
 Scheintod, 58, 60, 64, 73, 197
 shipwreck, 180
 suicide, 220
 tempests, 215
Mubashshir ibn Fatik, 14
music
 in Longus, 188
names of Alexander
 Dhu'l-qarnain, 7, 8
Napoleon's Book of Fate, 301
narratee
 of the author, 175
 of the narrator, 175
narrative
 'chinese-box' structure, 193
 episodic, 414
 first person, 172, 191, 333, 345
 in medias res, 407
 irony, 202
 nested, 102
narrator
 ambivalence of, 196, 199
 as a distorting lens, 178
 inferior perspective of, 181, 188
 omniscient auctorial, 407
nature
 in the novel of Eugenianos, 362
necromancy, 223
New Comedy, 262, 295
Newman, F., 428
 The Hard-Boiled Virgin, 437
novel
 as open and polycentric form, 416
oarismòs, 318
The Oracles of Astrampsychos, 304
Ovid
 Metamorphoses, 224, 230, 241, 331
parody, 180, 232, 342
Pasolini, P.P.
 and Petronius, 413-424
passive protagonists
 of Greek novels, 426
Pastor of Hermas, 382
Perry, B.E., 44
Petronius, 289, 329-343, 345
 Cena, 296
 in 20th cent. Italian prose, 422
 Trimalchio, 347

Widow of Ephesus, 231
phantasia, 72
See also visual artefacts
Phlorios and Platzia Phlore, 385, 387
place
influence of - in Greek novels, 433
Plato
dialogue during journey, 242
on fiction, 101-113
Phaedrus, 181
Symposium, 182, 194
Plutarch
How Young Men Should Study Poetry, 162, 164, 203
Lycurgus, 166
On Isis and Osiris, 41
Polignac, F. de, 19
Polycarp, 149
popular literature
ancient, 301-314
Potter, D., 342
Prodromos, 359, 361
progymnasmata
in Byzantine literature, 359
prologues
in ancient literary criticism, 419
proper names
in the Arabic Alexander tradition, 31
Propertius, 332
'prosaics'
of the ancient novels, 255
prosimetrum, 415, 421
proverbs
Apuleius' interest in, 251
Psellos
on the ancient novels, 367
pseudo-documentarism, 301-314
Pseudo-Methodius, 6
pseudo-philosophers
satire on, 165
psychagõgia, 118
Quintilian
Minor declamations, 349
Qur'an
Sura, 4, 8, 18
reality effect, 306
Reardon, B.P., 428
reception
of ancient novels in Byzantine literature, 360
Richlin, A., 330
rituals
Dionysiac, 229
Romans
ignored in Greek novels, 432
Rumor
in Chariton, 260
Sachs, Hans, 393-400
Saint Agnes, 156
Sayings of the Philosophers, 17
Schmeling, G., 422
Second Sophistic, 240
Secret of Secrets, 17, 18
secular scripture, 431
Seidel, K., 429
Semonides, 324
Seneca
Controversies, 349
sexuality
in iambic poetry, 318
sleeplessness
symptom of love, 195
Smith, A., 330
Smith, O., 382
social hierarchies
and Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*, 50
Socrates
and Aesop, 69
sophrosyne, 133
in Longus' prologue, 177, 267
Sorel, C., 401
Spadaro, G., 390
spatial form
in *Hysmine & Hysminias*, 373
spectacle
and martyr accounts, 130
statues, 77, 92
Stephens, S.A., 429
stoning, 151
suffering
and Christianity, 132
Syriac narratives
concerning Alexander, 5
theatre space, 89
Theocritus, 186
theõria, 118
Thessalus of Tralles, 310
Till Eulenspiegel, 398
Tobit
and Ahiqar, 56
tragic reminiscences
in Apuleius' *Met.*, 224
in *Hysmine & Hysminias*, 377
translations, Arabic, 16
of the Greek *Alexander Romance*, 10, 12, 14, 23
Umara ibn Zayd, 11
Urfé, H. d'
Astrée, 406
Vergil
Aeneid, 212, 224
violence

representation of, 129-141
virginity, 154
male, 137
visual artefacts
emotive power of, 177, 180
See also: *phantasia*
Voltaire
Candide, 302
Wahb ibn Munabbih, 11
Walsh, P.G., 329
Waugh, E.H., 19
Wellek, R., 416
Weymann, K., 12, 33
Williamson, M., 437
Winkler, J., 37, 68
wisdom tradition
and Alexander, 15
women
as ‘objects’, 439
bodies of, 132
Wright, J., 329
Xenophon of Ephesus, 277, 290, 308
Zeitlin, F.I., 438

SUPPLEMENTS TO MNEMOSYNE

EDITED BY H. PINKSTER, H.S. VERSNEL, D.M. SCHENKEVELD, P. H. SCHRIJVERS AND S.R. SLINGS

11. RUTILIUS LUPUS. *De Figuris Sententiarum et Elocutionis.* Edited with Prolegomena and Commentary by E. Brooks. 1970. ISBN 90 04 01474 8
12. SMYTH, W.R. (ed.). *Thesaurus criticus ad Sexti Propertii textum.* 1970. ISBN 90 04 01475 6
13. LEVIN, D.N. *Apollonius' 'Argonautica' re-examined.* 1. The Neglected First and Second Books. 1971. ISBN 90 04 02575 8
14. REINMUTH, O.W. *The Ephebic Inscriptions of the Fourth Century B.C.* 1971. ISBN 90 04 01476 4
16. ROSE, K.F.C. *The Date and Author of the 'Satyricon'.* With an Introduction by J.P.Sullivan. 1971. ISBN 90 04 02578 2
18. WILLIS, J. *De Martiano Capella emendando.* 1971. ISBN 90 04 02580 4
19. HERINGTON, C.J. (ed.). *The Older Scholia on the Prometheus Bound.* 1972. ISBN 90 04 03455 2
20. THIEL, H. VAN. *Petron. Überlieferung und Rekonstruktion.* 1971. ISBN 90 04 02581 2
21. LOSADA, L.A. *The Fifth Column in the Peloponnesian War.* 1972. ISBN 90 04 03421 8
23. BROWN, V. *The Textual Transmission of Caesar's 'Civil War'.* 1972. ISBN 90 04 03457 9
24. LOOMIS, J.W. *Studies in Catullan Verse.* An Analysis of Word Types and Patterns in the Polymetra. 1972. ISBN 90 04 03429 3
27. GEORGE, E.V. *Aeneid VIII and the Aitia of Callimachus.* 1974. ISBN 90 04 03859 0
29. BERS, V. *Enallage and Greek Style.* 1974. ISBN 90 04 03786 1
37. SMITH, O.L. *Studies in the Scholia on Aeschylus. 1. The Recensions of Demetrius Triclinius.* 1975. ISBN 90 04 04220 2
39. SCHMELING, G.L. & J.H. STUCKEY. *A Bibliography of Petronius.* 1977. ISBN 90 04 04753 0
44. THOMPSON, W.E. *De Hagniae Hereditate. An Athenian Inheritance Case.* 1976. ISBN 90 04 04757 3
45. McGUSHIN, P. *Sallustius Crispus, 'Bellum Catilinae'. A Commentary.* 1977. ISBN 90 04 04835 9
46. THORNTON, A. *The Living Universe. Gods and Men in Virgil's Aeneid.* 1976. ISBN 90 04 04579 1
48. BRENK, F.E. *In Mist apparelled. Religious Themes in Plutarch's 'Moralia' and 'Lives'.* 1977. ISBN 90 04 05241 0
51. SUSSMAN, L.A. *The Elder Seneca.* 1978. ISBN 90 04 05759 5
57. BOER, W. DEN. *Private Morality in Greece and Rome.* Some Historical Aspects. 1979. ISBN 90 04 05976 8
61. *Hieronymus' Liber de optimo genere interpretandi (Epistula 57).* Ein Kommentar von G.J.M. Bartelink. 1980. ISBN 90 04 06085 5
63. HOHENDAHL-ZOETELIEF, I.M. *Manners in the Homeric Epic.* 1980. ISBN 90 04 06223 8
64. HARVEY, R.A. *A Commentary on Persius.* 1981. ISBN 90 04 06313 7
65. MAXWELL-STUART, P.G. *Studies in Greek Colour Terminology.* 1. γλαυκός. 1981. ISBN 90 04 06406 0
68. ACHARD, G. *Pratique rhétorique et idéologie politique dans les discours 'Optimates' de Cicéron.* 1981. ISBN 90 04 06374 9

69. MANNING, C.E. *On Seneca's 'Ad Marciam'.* 1981. ISBN 90 04 06430 3
70. BERTHIAUME, G. *Les rôles du Mágeiros.* Etude sur la boucherie, la cuisine et le sacri ce dans la Grèce ancienne. 1982. ISBN 90 04 06554 7
71. CAMPBELL, M. *A commentary on Quintus Smyrnaeus Posthomerica XII.* 1981. ISBN 90 04 06502 4
72. CAMPBELL, M. *Echoes and Imitations of Early Epic in Apollonius Rhodius.* 1981. ISBN 90 04 06503 2
73. MOSKALEW, W. *Formular Language and Poetic Design in the Aeneid.* 1982. ISBN 90 04 06580 6
74. RACE, W.H. *The Classical Priamel from Homer to Boethius.* 1982. ISBN 90 04 06515 6
75. MOORHOUSE, A.C. *The Syntax of Sophocles.* 1982. ISBN 90 04 06599 7
77. WITKE, C. *Horace's Roman Odes.* A Critical Examination. 1983. ISBN 90 04 07006 0
78. ORANJE, J. *Euripides' 'Bacchae'.* The Play and its Audience. 1984. ISBN 90 04 07011 7
79. STATIUS. *Thebaidos Libri XII.* Recensuit et cum apparatu critico et exegetico instruxit D.E. Hill. 1983. ISBN 90 04 06917 8
82. DAM, H.-J. VAN. *P. Papinius Statius, Silvae Book II.* A Commentary. 1984. ISBN 90 04 07110 5
84. OBER, J. *Fortress Attica. Defense of the Athenian Land Frontier, 404-322 B.C.* 1985. ISBN 90 04 07243 8
85. HUBBARD, T.K. *The Pindaric Mind.* A Study of Logical Structure in Early Greek Poetry. 1985. ISBN 90 04 07303 5
86. VERDENIUS, W.J. *A Commentary on Hesiod: Works and Days*, vv. 1-382. 1985. ISBN 90 04 07465 1
87. HARDER, A. *Euripides' 'Kresphontes' and 'Archelaos'.* Introduction, Text and Commentary. 1985. ISBN 90 04 07511 9
88. WILLIAMS, H.J. *The 'Eclogues' and 'Cynegetica' of Nemesianus.* Edited with an Introduction and Commentary. 1986. ISBN 90 04 07486 4
89. McGING, B.C. *The Foreign Policy of Mithridates VI Eupator, King of Pontus.* 1986. ISBN 90 04 07591 7
91. SIDEBOTHAM, S.E. *Roman Economic Policy in the Erythra Thalassa 30 B.C.-A.D. 217.* 1986. ISBN 90 04 07644 1
92. VOGEL, C.J. DE. *Rethinking Plato and Platonism.* 2nd impr. of the rst (1986) ed. 1988. ISBN 90 04 08755 9
93. MILLER, A.M. *From Delos to Delphi.* A Literary Study of the Homeric Hymn to Apollo. 1986. ISBN 90 04 07674 3
94. BOYLE, A.J. *The Chaonian Dove.* Studies in the Eclogues, Georgics and Aeneid of Virgil. 1986. ISBN 90 04 07672 7
95. KYLE, D.G. *Athletics in Ancient Athens.* 2nd impr. of the rst (1987) ed. 1993. ISBN 90 04 09759 7
97. VERDENIUS, W.J. *Commentaries on Pindar. Vol. I. Olympian Odes 3, 7, 12, 14.* 1987. ISBN 90 04 08126 7
98. PROIETTI, G. *Xenophon's Sparta.* An introduction. 1987. ISBN 90 04 08338 3
99. BREMER, J.M., A.M. VAN ERP TAALMAN KIP & S.R. SLINGS. *Some Recently Found Greek Poems.* Text and Commentary. 1987. ISBN 90 04 08319 7
100. OPHUIJSEN, J.M. VAN. *Hephaistion on Metre.* Translation and Commentary. 1987. ISBN 90 04 08452 5
101. VERDENIUS, W.J. *Commentaries on Pindar. Vol. II.* Olympian Odes 1, 10, 11, Nemean 11, Isthmian 2. 1988. ISBN 90 04 08535 1
102. LUSCHNIG, C.A.E. *Time holds the Mirror. A Study of Knowledge in Euripides' 'Hippolytus'.* 1988. ISBN 90 04 08601 3
103. MARCOVICH, M. *Alcestis Barcinonensis.* Text and Commentary. 1988. ISBN 90 04 08600 5

104. HOLT, F.L. *Alexander the Great and Bactria.* The Formation of a Greek Frontier in Cen-tral Asia. Repr. 1993. ISBN 90 04 08612 9
105. BILLERBECK, M. *Seneca's Tragödien; sprachliche und stilistische Untersuchungen.* Mit Anhängen zur Sprache des Hercules Oetaeus und der Octavia. 1988. ISBN 90 04 08631 5
106. ARENDS, J.F.M. *Die Einheit der Polis. Eine Studie über Platons Staat.* 1988. ISBN 90 04 08785 0
107. BOTER, G.J. *The Textual Tradition of Plato's Republic.* 1988. ISBN 90 04 08787 7
108. WHEELER, E.L. *Stratagem and the Vocabulary of Military Trickery.* 1988. ISBN 90 04 08831 8
109. BUCKLER, J. *Philip II and the Sacred War.* 1989. ISBN 90 04 09095 9
110. FULLERTON, M.D. *The Archaistic Style in Roman Statuary.* 1990. ISBN 90 04 09146 7
111. ROTHWELL, K.S. *Politics and Persuasion in Aristophanes' 'Ecclesiazusae'.* 1990. ISBN 90 04 09185 8
112. CALDER, W.M. & A. DEMANDT. *Eduard Meyer.* Leben und Leistung eines Universalhistorikers. 1990. ISBN 90 04 09131 9
113. CHAMBERS, M.H. *Georg Busolt. His Career in His Letters.* 1990. ISBN 90 04 09225 0
114. CASWELL, C.P. *A Study of 'Thumos' in Early Greek Epic.* 1990. ISBN 90 04 09260 9
115. EINGARTNER, J. *Isis und ihre Dienerinnen in der Kunst der Römischen Kaiserzeit.* 1991. ISBN 90 04 09312 5
116. JONG, I. DE. *Narrative in Drama.* The Art of the Euripidean Messenger-Speech. 1991. ISBN 90 04 09406 7
117. BOYCE, B.T. *The Language of the Freedmen in Petronius'* Cena Trimalchionis. 1991. ISBN 90 04 09431 8
118. RÜTTEN, Th. *Demokrit — lachender Philosoph und sanguinischer Melancholiker.* 1992. ISBN 90 04 09523 3
119. KARAVITES, P. (with the collaboration of Th. Wren). *Promise-Giving and Treaty-Making.* Homer and the Near East. 1992. ISBN 90 04 09567 5
120. SANTORO L'HOIR, F. *The Rhetoric of Gender Terms.* 'Man', 'Woman' and the portrayal of character in Latin prose. 1992. ISBN 90 04 09512 8
121. WALLINGA, H.T. *Ships and Sea-Power before the Great Persian War.* The Ancestry of the Ancient Trireme. 1993. ISBN 90 04 09650 7
122. FARRON, S. *Vergil's Æneid: A Poem of Grief and Love.* 1993. ISBN 90 04 09661 2
123. LÉTOUBLON, F. *Les lieux communs du roman.* Stéréotypes grecs d'aventure et d'amour. 1993. ISBN 90 04 09724 4
124. KUNTZ, M. *Narrative Setting and Dramatic Poetry.* 1993. ISBN 90 04 09784 8
125. THEOPHRASTUS. *Metaphysics.* With an Introduction, Translation and Commentary by Marlein van Raalte. 1993. ISBN 90 04 09786 4
126. THIERMANN, P. *Die* Orationes Homeri *des Leonardo Bruni Aretino.* Kritische Edition der lateinischen und kastilianischen Übersetzung mit Prolegomena und Kommentar. 1993. ISBN 90 04 09719 8
127. LEVENE, D.S. *Religion in Livy.* 1993. ISBN 90 04 09617 5
128. PORTER, J.R. *Studies in Euripides'* Orestes. 1993. ISBN 90 04 09662 0
129. SICKING, C.M.J. & J.M. VAN OPHUIJSEN. *Two Studies in Attic Particle Usage.* Lysias and Plato. 1993. ISBN 90 04 09867 4
130. JONG, I.J.F. DE, & J.P. SULLIVAN (eds.). *Modern Critical Theory and Classical Literature.* 1994. ISBN 90 04 09571 3
131. YAMAGATA, N. *Homeric Morality.* 1994. ISBN 90 04 09872 0
132. KOVACS, D. *Euripidea.* 1994. ISBN 90 04 09926 3
133. SUSSMAN, L.A. *The Declamations of Calpurnius Flaccus.* Text, Translation, and Commentary. 1994. ISBN 90 04 09983 2
134. SMOLENAARS, J.J.L. *Statius*: Thebaid VII. A Commentary. 1994. ISBN 90 04 10029 6
135. SMALL, D.B. (ed.). *Methods in the Mediterranean.* Historical and Archaeological Views on Texts and Archaeology. 1995. ISBN 90 04 09581 0
136. DOMINIK, W.J. *The Mythic Voice of Statius.* Power and Politics in the *Thebaid.* 1994. ISBN 90 04 09972 7

137. SLINGS, S.R. *Plato's Apology of Socrates*. A Literary and Philosophical Study with a Running Commentary. Edited and Completed from the Papers of the Late E. De Strycker, s.j. 1994. ISBN 90 04 10103 9
138. FRANK, M. *Seneca's* Phoenissae. Introduction and Commentary. 1995. ISBN 90 04 09776 7
139. MALKIN, I. & Z.W. RUBINSOHN (eds.). *Leaders and Masses in the Roman World*. Studies in Honor of Zvi Yavetz. 1995. ISBN 90 04 09917 4
140. SEGAL, A. *Theatres in Roman Palestine and Provincia Arabia*. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10145 4
141. CAMPBELL, M. *A Commentary on Apollonius Rhodius* Argonautica III 1-471. 1994. ISBN 90 04 10158 6
142. DeFOREST, M.M. *Apollonius'* Argonautica: *A Callimachean Epic*. 1994. ISBN 90 04 10017 2
143. WATSON, P.A. *Ancient Stepmothers*. Myth, Misogyny and Reality. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10176 4
144. SULLIVAN, S.D. *Psychological and Ethical Ideas*. What Early Greeks Say. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10185 3
145. CARGILL, J. *Athenian Settlements of the Fourth Century B.C.* 1995. ISBN 90 04 09991 3
146. PANAYOTAKIS, C. *Theatrum Arbitri*. Theatrical Elements in the *Satyrica* of Petronius. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10229 9
147. GARRISON, E.P. *Groaning Tears*. Ethical and Dramatic Aspects of Suicide in Greek Tragedy. 1995. 90 04 10241 8
148. OLSON, S.D. *Blood and Iron*. Stories and Storytelling in Homer's *Odyssey*. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10251 5
149. VINOGRADOV, J.G.& S.D. KRYZICKIJ (eds.). *Olbia*. Eine altgriechische Stadt im Nordwestlichen Schwarzmeerraum. 1995. ISBN 90 04 09677 9
150. MAURER, K. *Interpolation in Thucydides*. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10300 7
151. HORSFALL, N. (ed.) *A Companion to the Study of Virgil*. 1995 ISBN 90 04 09559 4
152. KNIGHT, V.H. *The Renewal of Epic*. Responses to Homer in the *Argonautica* of Apollo-nius. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10386 4
153. LUSCHNIG, C.A.E. *The Gorgon's Severed Head*. Studies of *Alcestis*, *Electra*, and *Phoenissae*. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10382 1
154. NAVARRO ANTOLÍN, F. (ed.). *Lygdamus*. Corpus Tibullianum III. 1-6: Lygdami elegiarum liber. Translated by J.J. Zoltowski. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10210 8
155. MATTHEWS, V.J. *Antimachus of Colophon*. Text and Commentary. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10468 2
156. TREISTER, M.Y. *The Role of Metals in Ancient Greek History*. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10473 9
157. WORTHINGTON, I. (ed.). *Voice into Text*. Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10431 3
158. WIJSMAN, H.J.W. *Valerius Flaccus*, Argonautica, *Book V*. A Commentary. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10506 9
159. SCHMELING, G. (ed.). *The Novel in the Ancient World*. 1996. ISBN 90 04 09630 2
160. SICKING, C.M.J. & P. STORK. *Two Studies in the Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek*. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10460 7
161. KOVACS, D. *Euripidea Altera*. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10624 3
162. GERA, D. *Warrior Women*. The Anonymous Tractatus *De Mulieribus*. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10665 0
163. MORRIS, I. & B. POWELL (eds.). *A New Companion to Homer*. 1997. ISBN 90 04 09989 1
164. ORLIN, E.M. *Temples, Religion and Politics in the Roman Republic*. 1997.ISBN 90 04 10708 8
165. ALBRECHT, M. VON. *A History of Roman Literature*. From Livius Andronicus to Boethius with Special Regard to Its Influence on World Literature. 2 Vols.Revised by G.Schmeling and by the Author. Vol. 1: Translated with the Assistance of F. and K. Newman, Vol. 2: Translated with the Assitance of R.R. Caston and F.R. Schwartz. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10709 6 (Vol. 1), ISBN 90 04 10711 8 (Vol. 2), ISBN 90 04 10712 6 (Set)
166. DIJK, J.G.M. VAN. Αἶνοι, Λόγοι, Μῦθοι. Fables in Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic

Greek Literature. With a Study of the Theory and Terminology of the Genre. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10747 9

167. MAEHLER, H. (Hrsg.). *Die Lieder des Bakchylides.* Zweiter Teil: Die Dithyramben und Fragmente. Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10671 5
168. DILTS, M. & G.A. KENNEDY (eds.). *Two Greek Rhetorical Treatises from the Roman Empire.* Introduction, Text, and Translation of the Arts of Rhetoric Attributed to Anonymous Seguerianus and to Apsines of Gadara. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10728 2
169. GÜNTHER, H.-C. *Quaestiones Propertianae.* 1997. ISBN 90 04 10793 2
170. HEINZE, T. (Hrsg.). *P. Ovidius Naso. Der* XII. *Heroidenbrief: Medea an Jason.* Einleitung, Text und Kommentar. Mit einer Beilage: Die Fragmente der Tragödie *Medea.* 1997. ISBN 90 04 10800 9
171. BAKKER, E.J. (ed.). *Grammar as Interpretation.* Greek Literature in its Linguistic Contexts. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10730 4
172. GRAINGER, J.D. *A Seleukid Prosopography and Gazetteer.* 1997. ISBN 90 04 10799 1
173. GERBER, D.E. (ed.). *A Companion to the Greek Lyric Poets.* 1997. ISBN 90 04 09944 1
174. SANDY, G. *The Greek World of Apuleius.* Apuleius and the Second Sophistic. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10821 1
175. ROSSUM-STEENBEEK, M. VAN. *Greek Readers' Digests?* Studies on a Selection of Subliterary Papyri. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10953 6
176. McMAHON, J.M. *Paralysin Cave.* Impotence, Perception, and Text in the *Satyrica* of Petronius. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10825 4
177. ISAAC, B. *The Near East under Roman Rule.* Selected Papers. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10736 3
178. KEEN, A.G. *Dynastic Lycia.* A Political History of the Lycians and Their Relations with Foreign Powers, c. 545-362 B.C. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10956 0
179. GEORGIADOU, A. & D.H.J. LARMOUR. *Lucian's Science Fiction Novel* True Histories. Interpretation and Commentary. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10667 7
180. GÜNTHER, H.-C. *Ein neuer metrischer Traktat und das Studium der pindarischen Metrik in der Philologie der Paläologenzeit.* 1998. ISBN 90 04 11008 9
181. HUNT, T.J. *A Textual History of Cicero's* Academici Libri. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10970 6
182. HAMEL, D. *Athenian Generals.* Military Authority in the Classical Period. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10900 5
183. WHITBY, M. (ed.). *The Propaganda of Power.* The Role of Panegyric in Late Antiquity. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10571 9
184. SCHRIER, O.J. *The* Poetics *of Aristotle and the* Tractatus Coislinianus. A Bibliography from about 900 till 1996. 1998. ISBN 90 04 11132 8
185. SICKING, C.M.J. *Distant Companions.* Selected Papers. 1998. ISBN 90 04 11054 2
186. P.H. SCHRIJVERS. *Lucrèce et les Sciences de la Vie.* 1999. ISBN 90 04 10230 2
187. BILLERBECK M. (Hrsg.). *Seneca.* Hercules Furens. Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11245 6
188. MACKAY, E.A. (ed.). *Signs of Orality.* The Oral Tradition and Its Influence in the Greek and Roman World. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11273 1
189. ALBRECHT, M. VON. *Roman Epic.* An Interpretative Introduction. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11292 8
190. HOUT, M.P.J. VAN DEN. *A Commentary on the Letters of M. Cornelius Fronto.* 1999. ISBN 90 04 10957 9
191. KRAUS, C. SHUTTLEWORTH. (ed.). *The Limits of Historiography.* Genre and Narrative in Ancient Historical Texts. 1999. ISBN 90 04 10670 7
192. LOMAS, K. & T. CORNELL. *Cities and Urbanisation in Ancient Italy.* ISBN 90 04 10808 4 *In preparation*
193. TSETSKHLADZE, G.R. (ed.). *History of Greek Colonization and Settlement Overseas.* 2 vols. ISBN 90 04 09843 7 *In preparation*
194. WOOD, S.E. *Imperial Women.* A Study in Public Images, 40 B.C. - A.D. 68. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11281 2

195. OPHUIJSEN, J.M. VAN & P. STORK. *Linguistics into Interpretation.* Speeches of War in Herodotus VII 5 & 8-18. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11455 6
196. TSETSKHLADZE, G.R. (ed.). *Ancient Greeks West and East.* 1999. ISBN 90 04 11190 5
197. PFEIJFFER, I.L. *Three Aeginetan Odes of Pindar.* A Commentary on *Nemean* V, *Nemean* III, & *Pythian* VIII. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11381 9
198. HORSFALL, N. *Virgil,* Aeneid *7.* A Commentary. 2000. ISBN 90 04 10842 4
199. IRBY-MASSIE, G.L. *Military Religion in Roman Britain.* 1999. ISBN 90 04 10848 3
200. GRAINGER, J.D. *The League of the Aitolians.* 1999. ISBN 90 04 10911 0
201. ADRADOS, F.R. *History of the Graeco-Roman Fable.* I: Introduction and from the Origins to the Hellenistic Age. Translated by L.A. Ray. Revised and Updated by the Author and Gert-Jan van Dijk. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11454 8
202. GRAINGER, J.D. *Aitolian Prosopographical Studies.* 2000. ISBN 90 04 11350 9
203. SOLOMON, J. *Ptolemy* Harmonics. Translation and Commentary. 2000. ISBN 90 04 115919
204. WIJSMAN, H.J.W. *Valerius Flaccus,* Argonautica, *Book VI.* A Commentary. 2000. ISBN 90 04 11718 0
205. MADER, G. *Josephus and the Politics of Historiography.* Apologetic and Impression Management in the *Bellum Judaicum.* 2000. ISBN 90 04 11446 7
206. NAUTA, R.R. *Poetry for Patrons.* Literary Communication in the Age of Domitian. 2000. ISBN 90 04 10885 8
207. ADRADOS, F.R. *History of the Graeco-Roman Fable.* II: The Fable during the Roman Empire and in the Middle Ages. Translated by L.A. Ray. Revised and Updated by the Author and Gert-Jan van Dijk. 2000. ISBN 90 04 11583 8
208. JAMES, A. & K. LEE. *A Commentary on Quintus of Smyrna,* Posthomerica V. 2000. ISBN 90 04 11594 3
209. DERDERIAN, K. *Leaving Words to Remember.* Greek Mourning and the Advent of Literacy. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11750 4
210. SHORROCK, R. *The Challenge of Epic.* Allusive Engagement in the *Dionysiaca* of Nonnus. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11795 4
211. SCHEIDEL, W. (ed.). *Debating Roman Demography.* 2001. ISBN 90 04 11525 0
212. KEULEN, A.J. *L. Annaeus Seneca* Troades. Introduction, Text and Commentary. 2001. ISBN 90 04 12004 1
213. MORTON, J. *The Role of the Physical Environment in Ancient Greek Seafaring.* 2001. ISBN 90 04 11717 2
214. GRAHAM, A.J. *Collected Papers on Greek Colonization.* 2001. ISBN 90 04 11634 6
215. GROSSARDT, P. *Die Erzählung von Meleagros.* Zur literarischen Entwicklung der kalydonischen Kultlegende. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11952 3
216. ZAFIROPOULOS, C.A. *Ethics in Aesop's Fables: The* Augustana *Collection.* 2001. ISBN 90 04 11867 5
217. RENGAKOS, A. & T.D. Papanghelis (eds.). *A Companion to Apollonius Rhodius.* 2001. ISBN 90 04 11752 0
218. WATSON, J. *Speaking Volumes.* Orality and Literacy in the Greek and Roman World. 2001. ISBN 90 04 12049 1
219. MACLEOD, L. *Dolos and Dike in Sophokles'* Elektra. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11898 5
220. MCKINLEY, K.L. *Reading the Ovidian Heroine.* "Metamorphoses" Commentaries 1100-1618. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11796 2
221. REESON, J. *Ovid* Heroides *11, 13 and 14.* A Commentary. 2001. ISBN 90 04 12140 4
222. FRIED, M.N. & S. UNGURU. *Apollonius of Perga's* Conica: Text, Context, Subtext. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11977 9
223. LIVINGSTONE, N. *A Commentary on Isocrates'* Busiris. 2001. ISBN 90 04 12143 9

224. LEVENE, D.S. & D.P. NELIS (eds.). *Clio and the Poets.* Augustan Poetry and the Traditions of Ancient Historiography. 2002. ISBN 90 04 11782 2
225. WOOTEN, C.W. *The Orator in Action and Theory in Greece and Rome.* 2001. ISBN 90 04 12213 3
226. GALÁN VIOQUE, G. *Martial, Book VII. A Commentary.* 2001. ISBN 90 04 12338 5
227. LEFÈVRE, E. *Die Unfähigkeit, sich zu erkennen: Sophokles' Tragödien.* 2001. ISBN 90 04 12322 9
228. SCHEIDEL, W. *Death on the Nile.* Disease and the Demography of Roman Egypt. 2001. ISBN 90 04 12323 7
229. SPANOUDAKIS, K. *Philitas of Cos.* 2002. ISBN 90 04 12428 4
230. WORTHINGTON, I. & J.M. FOLEY (eds.). *Epea and Grammata.* Oral and written Communication in Ancient Greece. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12455 1
231. McKECHNIE, P. (ed.). *Thinking Like a Lawyer.* Essays on Legal History and General History for John Crook on his Eightieth Birthday. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12474 8
232. GIBSON, R.K. & C. SHUTTLEWORTH KRAUS (eds.). *The Classical Commentary.* Histories, Practices, Theory. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12153 6
233. JONGMAN, W. & M. KLEIJWEGT (eds.). *After the Past.* Essays in Ancient History in Honour of H.W. Pleket. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12816 6
234. GORMAN, V.B. & E.W. ROBINSON (eds.). *Oikistes.* Studies in Constitutions, Colonies, and Military Power in the Ancient World. Offered in Honor of A.J. Graham. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12579 5
235. HARDER, A., R. REGTUIT, P. STORK, G. WAKKER (eds.). *Noch einmal zu....* Kleine Schriften von Stefan Radt zu seinem 75. Geburtstag. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12794 1
236. ADRADOS, F.R. *History of the Graeco-Latin Fable.* Volume Three: Inventory and Documentation of the Graeco-Latin Fable. 2002. ISBN 90 04 11891 8
237. SCHADE, G. *Stesichoros.* Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 2359, 3876, 2619, 2803. 2003. ISBN 90 04 12832 8
238. ROSEN, R.M. & I. SLUITER (eds.) *Andreia.* Studies in Manliness and Courage in Classical Antiquity. 2003. ISBN 90 04 11995 7
239. GRAINGER, J.D. *The Roman War of Antiochos the Great.* 2002. ISBN 90 04 12840 9
240. KOVACS, D. *Euripidea Tertia.* 2003. ISBN 90 04 12977 4
241. PANAYOTAKIS, S., M. ZIMMERMAN, W. KEULEN (eds.). *The Ancient Novel and Beyond.* 2003. ISBN 90 04 12999 5
242. ZACHARIA, K. C*onverging Truths.* Euripides' *Ion* and the Athenian Quest for Self-Definition. 2003. ISBN 90 0413000 4
243. ALMEIDA, J.A. *Justice as an Aspect of the Polis Idea in Solon's Political Poems.* 2003. ISBN 90 04 13002 0
244. HORSFALL, N. *Virgil, Aeneid 11.* A Commentary. 2003. ISBN 90 04 12934 0
245. VON ALBRECHT, M. *Cicero's Style.* A Synopsis. Followed by Selected Analytic Studies 2003. ISBN 90 04 12961 8